DECEMBER 1963

MONTHLY REVIEW

WRIGHT [illegible] LIBRARY
3400 NORTH AUSTIN AVENUE
CHICAGO 34, ILLINOIS

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

IMPERIALISM AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

THE EDITORS

VOL. 15
8

WHAT DO THE RUSSIANS WANT?

KONNI ZILLIACUS

NOT FEUDALISM—CAPITALISM

ANDREW GUNDER FRANK

The Shame of Okinawa

JAMES DIAMOND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME FIFTEEN NUMBER EIGHT DECEMBER 1963

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY 417
REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Imperialism and National Independence 418
THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT: A REPLY by Max Gordon 432
WHAT DO THE RUSSIANS WANT? by Konni Zilliacus 443
THE SHAME OF OKINAWA by James Diamond 453
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 462
BOOKS: NOT FEUDALISM — CAPITALISM by Andrew Gunder Frank 468

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright ©1964, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign. By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11. By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

The response to MR's annual Xmas book sale, announced in last month's issue and repeated in this month's center spread, has been good. Many readers obviously have recognized and welcomed a way of solving their gift problem which also helps the socialist cause, and we hope many more will in the next three weeks. But our offer of gift subs (see back cover) has not been so successful as yet. Please don't overlook this offer: in the final analysis, the whole MR enterprise rests on the foundation of circulation. Help us build it up!

Both Gordon Lewis' *Puerto Rico* and Cedric Belfrage's *The Man at the Door with the Gun* are off the press, and both are very handsome books. After December 31, Lewis will be priced at $10.00, Belfrage at $4.50. But until then you can get them for $5.00 and $2.50, respectively. If you're like us and like to buy books but don't like to pay today's high prices, you'll make very sure to get your order in before the end of the month.

MR Press is continuing to expand its book publication program. In addition to *Puerto Rico* and *The Man at the Door with the Gun,* no fewer than six titles are now in the works. They are:

(1) *In Place of Fear,* by Aneurin Bevan. This exposition of the political philosophy of the Welsh coalminer who became the leader of the

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

As we go to press, the shocking news comes of President Kennedy's assassination. We have been consistently critical of his administration and its policies ever since it took office three years ago, but never on a personal level. The Marxian standpoint, as Marx himself wrote in the Preface to Capital, *"can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains." John F. Kennedy was, and had to be, a representative of the class that rules not only the United States but the largest empire in world history. Our criticisms of him have always aimed at that class and the system which sustains it. From this point of view, his assassination can only be looked upon as a senseless, cruel, abhorrent act. It is always shocking when a man in the full prime of life is suddenly cut down; it reminds us all too painfully of the frailty of life, of the perils of chance that threaten each one of us. When the man is President of a great country whose people are tied to him emotionally by a thousand bonds—complex, intertwined, contradictory—the shock and pain and threat are immeasurably intensified. We all died a little with John F. Kennedy, and we all suffer with his family and his personal friends and associates.*

The press reports that the man who has been charged with the assassination proclaims himself a Marxist. Perhaps he thinks of himself as such; if so, he is sadly mistaken. Ever since Marx himself fought the anarchists for control of the First International, Marxists have led the fight in revolutionary movements against the tactic of individual terrorism. Marxism teaches class solidarity and open struggle against an inhuman system. Assassination, by contrast, is the demented progeny of philosophical and practical individualism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMPERIALISM AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The unusually heavy mail evoked by our latest discussion of the Sino-Soviet conflict ("What Do the Chinese Want?" in the October issue) testifies to a profound interest in this subject, apparently shared by all sections of the Left. On analysis, the mail also testifies to a remarkable disparity of views among people who consider themselves to be socialists, on just about every aspect of the conflict. This situation clearly calls for continuing discussion. And the objective of the discussion must be not only to determine the rights and wrongs of the debate but, perhaps even more important at this stage, to get a clear understanding of what the real issues are.

With these ends in view, we have selected for publication the criticism of our October editorial which seems to us most suitable for advancing the discussion a step forward ("The Sino-Soviet Conflict: A Reply," by Max Gordon, beginning on page 432 below). Since what follows is an analysis of Gordon's arguments, readers will be able to follow more easily if they read Gordon's article first.*

Following a brief introduction, Gordon divides his criticism into three parts which he entitles "War, Peace, and the Bomb," "Imperialism Yesterday and Today," and "The Role of Independent Nations." It will be convenient to divide this rejoinder in the same way.

(1) *War, Peace, and the Bomb.* Underlying what Gordon has to say under this heading is a thesis which may be sum-

* As the reader will see, we find it necessary to correct what seems to us to be misrepresentations and distortions of the Chinese position. It is therefore relevant to note that our understanding of the Chinese position is based not only on published sources but also on long and close questioning of responsible Chinese officials whom we had the opportunity to meet in Mexico City and London during recent months.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marized as follows: Nuclear weapons have transformed the nature of warfare; either ignoring or denying this, the Chinese advocate policies which greatly increase the danger of a world thermonuclear holocaust. It is not at all clear, however, what these dangerous policies are supposed to be. At one point, Gordon seems to concede that the Chinese themselves do not act in a warlike fashion but only urge the Russians to do so. But this line is not followed up, possibly because Gordon could find nothing in the record to support it. Next he accuses the Chinese of not doing anything to safeguard against an accidental nuclear war, though it is hard to see what they could do since they have no nuclear weapons which might go off accidentally. He inaccurately represents and disapproves of Mao's statement (made at the Moscow conference of Communist Parties in 1957) that if imperialism starts a nuclear war and a third or half of the world's population is wiped out, socialism will nevertheless survive while capitalism will not; but he fails to explain how Mao's position on this differs from what Soviet leaders have often said—for example in the Program adopted at the Twenty-second Congress of the CPSU: "Should the imperialist aggressors nevertheless venture to start a new world war, the peoples will no longer tolerate a system which drags them into devastating wars. They will sweep imperialism away and bury it." Both Mao and the Russians may both be wrong, but it is nonsense to assert or imply that such statements are evidence of a warlike policy.

Gordon dismisses as obsolete the Chinese contention that morale determines the outcome of wars, since morale is of little avail against A- and H-bombs. What he fails to notice is that while this may be correct, it does not invalidate the Chinese contention as applied to non-nuclear wars, several of which are being fought right now and dozens of which have been fought since the end of the Second World War. Gordon makes an obfuscating comparison between fascism (a social phenomenon) and the emergence of nuclear weapons (a technological phenomenon), winding up with the declaration that it is "not exactly wild to assume that the elimination of the possibility of nuclear destruction is likewise in the interests of the United States and other imperialist powers." If he will check back over the Chinese

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

documents which he cites, Gordon will find that the Chinese make precisely this assumption and on this basis take a relatively optimistic view of the possibility of preventing nuclear war.

We see thus that all Gordon succeeds in doing is to attribute to the Chinese, by misrepresentation and innuendo, a position which has absolutely nothing in common with either what they say or what they do. What, then, do the Chinese really think about "war, peace, and the bomb"?

To begin with, as already noted, they think a world nuclear war can be avoided because it is in the mutual interest of the nuclear powers to avoid it (the widespread notion that the Chinese deny the possibility of agreements between capitalist and socialist states on the basis of mutual interest, is completely unfounded). But they do not believe that imperialism has renounced or ever will renounce war in general as a method of attaining its aims. Lenin's writings, four decades of experience since Lenin's death, and the policies and massive war preparations of the imperialists all support this view. So does Khrushchev, who was quoted in the July 14th open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU as follows: "There will be wars of liberation as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars; such wars are not only permissible but even unavoidable, since the colonialists do not grant independence to people voluntarily. Therefore it is only through struggle, including armed struggle, that the peoples can win their freedom and independence."

With respect to the bomb, the Chinese are as aware of its destructiveness as the Americans or Russians or anyone else, and they assert with maximum emphasis that under *no* circumstances should a socialist country be the first to use it. They also assert, however, that under no circumstances should a socialist country or a revolutionary movement allow itself to be blackmailed by imperialist threats to use the bomb: the only way to defeat blackmail, atomic or otherwise, is to stand up to it. They want their own bomb for exactly the same reason the Russians wanted theirs, and they regard it as sheer hypocrisy for nations that already have the bomb to tell them what they should and should not do. As for relying on the Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nuclear deterrent, they do not believe that the Russians have overcome their deep-rooted tendency to arrogate to themselves the right to determine the policy of other Communist Parties and socialist countries, and the Chinese have already had a bitter experience in the Soviet withdrawal of technicians. Having been kicked around the international stage for a couple of hundred years, more or less, the Chinese believe in the necessity of building up their own strength, military as well as economic. This, and not any hankering for nuclear war, is what underlies their rejection of the test-ban treaty. At the same time, the Chinese say to the nuclear powers: If you will give up all your bombs and rockets, we will be glad to give up our efforts to acquire them.

(2) *Imperialism Yesterday and Today.* Under this heading, Gordon's chief contentions can be summed up as follows: Imperialism isn't what it used to be. The growth of the socialist world and the necessity for the capitalists to compete with it, the crumbling of the old colonial empires, and the emergence of many new independent states—these and related developments have vastly weakened imperialism which is therefore no longer expanding but on the contrary is on the defensive, carrying out a desperate holding operation here and there but basically already doomed. The way to defeat it is through the "mobilization of world opinion by the united power of the underdeveloped nations" which constitute "the mass of humanity." The Chinese are urged to follow this course and to stop egging the Russians on to greater intervention on the perhaps mistaken idea that the imperialists will not start a nuclear war because they know the consequences for themselves. In contrast to this realistic view of the world today, the Chinese (and the editors of MR) are charged with believing that everything is as it used to be in Lenin's day, that imperialism's "character and . . . behavior remain the same."

In answering these arguments, we shall speak for ourselves rather than attempt to summarize the Chinese position—though we believe that in the main we are in agreement with the Chinese on these issues.

We do *not* believe that imperialism has remained the same. A large part of the world has been withdrawn from its clutches

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(the USSR, Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba), and, in what remains, the relative importance of the old colonial empires has drastically declined and that of the neocolonial American empire has spectacularly increased.

Neocolonialism, however, is by no means confined to the American empire: it is also practiced by the other imperialist powers, sometimes individually and in opposition to each other, as in the oil-rich Middle East, and sometimes collaboratively, as in the case of the Congo where the UN was used as an instrument to impose a sort of collective neocolonialism on the former Belgian colony. Gordon's idea that a country can escape imperialist domination and exploitation simply by gaining formal national independence is utterly fallacious. As long as it remains enmeshed in the capitalist world market, an underdeveloped country is *ipso facto* a subject of imperialist exploitation (manipulated prices for its exports and monopoly prices for its imports) and *at best* in constant danger of falling into renewed political subjugation. If it also accepts significant amounts of military and economic "aid" from imperialist countries, its political fate is all but sealed. Ruling "elites" (we will come to their class character presently) are in effect put on imperialist payrolls by such "aid" and become the domestic tools of foreign domination. Nor is their dependence on their imperialist masters confined to a purely employer-employee relationship. Inheriting the privileges of the former colonial bureaucrats and administrators, constantly exposed to imperialist flattery and bribery, regularly confronted with opportunities for speculative and commercial profits, these elites acquire wealth and privileges which set them apart from the mass of their impoverished fellow citizens even more sharply than the ruling class in advanced capitalist countries is set apart from the mass of workers. Since this is palpably and visibly an outrageously unjust and irrational situation, it inevitably engenders intense hostility between elites and masses, driving the former to rely ever more closely on the superior might of the imperialists for protection against their own peoples. *This process is in fact the quintessence of neocolonialism.* Its classical locus is Latin America which, as Gordon seems to recognize, is the very heart of the American empire.

What Gordon does not see, and indeed is prevented from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seeing by the theoretical preconceptions with which he approaches the problem, is that this very same form of neocolonial domination has been extended in the postwar period to vast areas of the globe, especially in the Near and Middle East and in Southeast Asia, and even now is being extended to even vaster areas, including the Indian subcontinent and most of Africa. The answer to Gordon's key question (posed on page 438) is thus most emphatically that the United States *is* fastening its oppression upon the peoples of Asia and Africa, as the Chinese maintain. What he mistakes for "a desperate holding operation in a few small nations of Asia, the residue of the colonial system" is in reality an effort to reassert imperialist domination over certain areas which had escaped or were on the verge of escaping imperialist domination altogether. The desperate character of the operation stems not from some outworn delusions in Washington, but from the fact that these areas are escaping not into a largely mythical "third world" but into the socialist camp from which the evils of imperialist domination and exploitation have been forever abolished and where the peoples have set about in earnest to build a civilization worthy of human beings. It is *this* the imperialists cannot abide, not that a few remaining colonies should gain their formal independence; and they cannot abide it because it gives new hope to the oppressed everywhere and shows them the road that they too must travel.

This is of course the barest outline of a sound theory of neocolonialism, and as such may give rise to misunderstandings. To avoid this, we add the following summary notes:

(a) In terms of class structure, there is considerable variation among today's neocolonies depending on their past history. But in every case the ruling position, that of first deputy to imperialism so to speak, is occupied by the bourgeoisie. In some cases (Brazil and Argentina, for example), the bourgeoisie is well developed and highly differentiated, including, though in different proportions, most of the subgroups observed in the imperialist countries themselves (industrialists, bankers, merchants, landlords, etc.); at the other extreme are the more primitive African countries, mostly former French colonies,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the bourgeoisie still exists, as it were, only in embryo. In these cases, there is a strong temptation to say that there is no bourgeoisie at all and that the ruling elite is the government "bureaucracy." The temptation should be resisted. Today's bureaucracy is generating tomorrow's bourgeoisie, and it is the values and ideals of the latter that already dominate the national scene. Or to put the point differently, the power of government position is used to gain wealth which, immediately or via one or more metamorphoses, takes the form of landed or commercial or financial capital (industrial capital will come later). This wealth in turn becomes the basis of a class, a group of people who are born into a certain station in life, in this case one of wealth and privilege; and this class will furnish the upper echelons of the governmental and military bureaucracy of the future. In general: where the institution of private property prevails, government must not, except for relatively brief transitional periods, be looked upon as the primary source of wealth, power, and privilege but as the instrument of the class which owns the dominant form(s) of property. And even during the brief periods when government is the primary source, the interests which it serves are those of the new ruling class which is coming into being.

(b) The struggle for national liberation from colonial rule in the strict sense is usually carried on by a coalition of class forces which, in order to enlist the widest possible support among the masses, puts forward such slogans as social justice and socialism. It also throws up national heroes—the sociologists call them charismatic leaders—who command the loyalty of all classes and who may or may not be sincere about wanting to attain the avowed goals of the struggle. These slogans and leaders continue to occupy the center of the stage after liberation, while behind the scenes the now dominant class—either in being or becoming—consolidates its power, augments its wealth, and establishes a firm neocolonialist relation with either the old or a new imperialist master. India, where the avowed socialist Nehru heads the reactionary Congress Party in building capitalism in the name of socialism, may be taken as the archetypal example of this form of transition from colony to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neocolony, with the process still not completed nearly two decades after liberation.

Gordon's fatal error, and that of those who think like him, including the Soviet leadership, is to take the slogans and the leaders for the reality and to ignore, or fail to understand the significance of, the underlying class developments which give content to the slogans and direction to the leaders.

Gordon asks (page 439): "But can it seriously be maintained that the great task before the people of Ghana or Nigeria or Guinea or Algeria is to stage a revolution against American imperialism? Or even that American imperialism bars revolutionary solutions which they may desire to apply to their problems?"

To answer the first question first: It most certainly can be seriously maintained with respect to Ghana, Nigeria, and probably Guinea. The only proviso is that the "revolution against American imperialism" will take the form of a socialist revolution against their own bourgeoisies—not now when the national liberation struggles are still fresh in mind and national heroes like Kwame Nkrumah and Sekou Touré still dominate the political scene, but later when the emerging class pattern has crystallized and the neocolonial status of these countries is as clear as that of all but one Latin American country, which won their national independence from Spain a century and a half ago. We say "probably Guinea" because there may still be some doubt about the continued domination of bourgeois property relations in that country. Algeria, on the other hand, presents different problems. There, it seems, real socialist property relations are in the process of being established. The struggle will therefore be to consolidate them and defend them against the counter-revolutionary assaults of French (and American) imperialist interventionism.

When Gordon asks whether American imperialism bars revolutionary solutions in these countries, one can only wonder where he has been these last ten years. Has he heard what happened to Mossadegh when he tried to nationalize Iranian oil? Or to Arbenz when he put through a genuine land reform? Where is Lumumba? What is going on in South Vietnam? Has the United States stood on the sidelines bemusedly watch-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing Cuba apply her revolutionary solutions? Why does he think Washington keeps more than a million men stationed in overseas military bases? Does he believe the tales about the terrible menace of Soviet aggression? Or does he perhaps believe that this is all just a travel program for young American soldiers? What does he think President Kennedy had in mind when, in a November 8th speech pleading with the Congress to restore foreign aid cuts he said that "it [foreign aid] helps to stave off the kind of chaos or Communist takeover or Communist attack that would surely demand our critical and costly attention"?

It is true, of course, that the United States is not all-powerful. Cuba has proved that. But Cuba has also proved that the only way to frustrate the designs of American imperialism is through a socialist revolution and a willingness to fight to the death to defend it. To go on preaching, in the face of these plain lessons of experience, that American imperialism can be defeated by "mobilization of world opinion" is—let us not mince words—to help disarm the victims of imperialist oppression and clear the road for further advances of neocolonialism.

(3) *The Role of Independent Nations.* Most of what Gordon says under this heading has already been answered in the foregoing discussion of neocolonialism. But some of the things he doesn't say are very relevant to an understanding of the world situation today.

There are countries which, judged solely by the foreign policies they pursue, are outside both the imperialist and the socialist camps and in this sense are independent or neutral. In Europe, Finland and Yugoslavia would seem to qualify; in Asia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia; in Africa, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, perhaps Algeria though this is far from clear. This is an off-the-cuff list, and we do not deny that there may be one or more that don't belong on it and others that do. But it is perfectly clear that there are many fewer than like to call themselves independent or "neutralist" and occasionally even make gestures which would be compatible with an independent posture. The reasons

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why a country pursues an independent policy are varied and subject to change. New developments, international and/or domestic, may destroy the basis of independence and propel a country into either the imperialist or the socialist camp. Not only *may* this happen: there are at work at all times powerful forces—allies of imperialism on the one side, revolutionaries on the other—which are striving to make it happen, and sooner or later one side or the other is very likely to achieve success. Independence between the two great world systems is thus a precarious and essentially transitory state of affairs, certainly not the distinguishing characteristic of a vast "third world" made up of "new" or "emerging" nations united in a crusade for peace and progress. Each independent nation, in fact, is a battlefield where the world systems struggle for supremacy, and its independence can be taken as a rough indication that, for the time being, the two sides are evenly balanced. It is against this background that one must evaluate the realism of Gordon's view that the independent nations can play a major—sometimes he even seems to imply a decisive—role in bringing peace and socialism to the world.

Lest we be misunderstood, we add two footnotes. First, independence in the sense discussed should not be confused with the status of military neutral such as is occupied by Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria. These are all highly developed capitalist countries which are obviously integral parts of the imperialist system. Militarily, however, they regard it as in their interest to remain outside alliances and blocs, and the leaders of the rival world systems have acquiesced (and in the case of Austria embodied their acquiescense in a formal treaty). It is quite possible that in the future the same principle will be applied to other areas—it has been suggested by de Gaulle, for example, that South Vietnam (or all of Vietnam) should be militarily neutralized as part of the terms for ending the war. This suggestion makes good sense and may well be adopted by a new Geneva Conference, but not until the Vietnamese themselves have conclusively proved to the Americans through armed struggle that they are not going to allow themselves to be reincorporated into the imperialist system.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, in putting the role of the independent nations into proper perspective, we do not mean to denigrate the status of independence or to deny that for countries in the imperialist camp every gesture or move toward independence is to be welcomed as a step forward, and for independent countries every gesture or step toward the imperialist camp is to be fought tooth and nail.

In conclusion, we must try to relate what has been said about imperialism and independence to the Sino-Soviet conflict. Gordon repeats several times the charge that the Chinese are urging the Soviet Union to adopt a perilously warlike attitude in support of revolutionary movements, especially, he implies, in Latin America. He cites no evidence, and we believe the reason is quite simply that there is none. But if this is so, the question remains: what *are* they fighting about? Surely it can't be anything so abstract as the theory of imperialism?

We happen to think that this is precisely what they are fighting about, though the motivations are by no means confined to a concern for scientific truth. The fact of the matter is that if the world Communist movement (using the term in its broadest sense) were to espouse Gordon's views—which, generally speaking, agree with the views of the Soviet leadership—there would be precious few revolutionaries for either the Russians or the Chinese to support. With the holy trinity of peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, and peaceful transition presiding over the march of history, everyone could go about his business secure in the knowledge that imperialism is a dying force and the vast majority of mankind is passing through the borderland of national independence to the promised land of socialism.

The Chinese believe, and we completely agree with them, that this is a formula for defeat and disaster for the world movement and hence a mortal threat to their own struggle to survive and build socialism. They believe, and again we completely agree with them, that imperialism remains a frightfully powerful force for evil and that only the determined revolutionary efforts of its victims can defeat it and allow mankind to move forward to a secure and better future. We may disagree

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the Chinese as to how soon successful revolutions can be carried through, but that, after all, is a strictly secondary matter. History is full of surprises, and if the victims of imperialism, who in very truth do constitute the vast majority of mankind, once become fully conscious of their situation and what is necessary to escape from it, our present reading of history's timetable may turn out to be unduly pessimistic.

In the Chinese view, the CPUSSR and all the other Communist Parties that follow its lead are doing their best to *prevent* the victims of imperialism from attaining this consciousness, and it is this above all that must be changed. Only a newly awakened, fearless, clear-sighted movement can win the great battles that lie ahead. The Chinese know as well as the Russians that revolution cannot be exported, that each country must make its own. But they also know that revolution can only be made by revolutionaries. Their quarrel with the Russians is over the making of revolutionaries, not over what kind of support the Russians or the Chinese or anyone else should provide for them. This is, to be sure, a not unimportant question, but it cannot be debated, still less settled, in general terms. Every case is unique and must be treated as such. About the most that can be said in the way of a guiding principle is to repeat the classic formula: From each according to his ability, to each according to his need. In the meantime, one thing is certain: without revolutionaries there will be no revolutions.

Konni Zilliacus's article "What Do the Russians Want?" (beginning on page 443 of this issue) was written at our request as a contribution to the discussion of the Sino-Soviet conflict, and our original intention was to answer Max Gordon and Zilliacus together. The latter's manuscript unfortunately arrived too late. We are nevertheless publishing it because it constitutes a useful supplement to Gordon, providing as it does an authoritative account of Soviet views and intentions. And we feel that in substance if not in form what we have said above, especially under the heading "War, Peace, and the Bomb," constitutes an adequate commentary on Zilliacus's main arguments. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would, however, like to add a brief postscript on one point.

Zilliacus reminds us that the Soviet Union today is "no longer a revolutionary, but a post-revolutionary, society, which has had its fill of war, violence, and the oppression and tyranny of Stalinism, and is apprehensive about the danger of a nuclear war." And again: "The Russians . . . are a post-revolutionary world power which is much more concerned to preserve world peace than to promote revolutions in other countries."

Exactly. The Russians have had their revolution and now want nothing so much as peace and quiet and time in which to reap and enjoy its fruits. Given the human capacity for rationalization, it is naturally easy for them to believe—quite sincerely—that what they want is what everyone else should want and to shape their ideas, their policies, and their propaganda accordingly. No one should be surprised at this, and complaining about it is about as useful as complaining about the time the sun rises and sets.

This is presumably Zilliacus's view, and we quite agree with it. But he fails to follow up his observation. In particular, he fails to notice that it means that by the very nature of its present position and circumstances, the leadership of the Soviet Union is profoundly unfitted to play the role of intellectual, political, and moral leader of a world revolutionary movement. The CPUSSR itself meets this situation by proclaiming in effect that there is no need for a world revolutionary movement. Max Gordon's article sums up the case for this view: imperialism is a dying system; socialism is advancing irresistibly; don't rock the boat and everything will turn out for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Naturally, the Communist Parties which continue to accept Soviet leadership cease to be revolutionary parties (if they haven't already done so a long time ago) and enter the road the social democratic parties have been traveling for more than half a century.

The trouble is, as we have tried to show in analyzing Max Gordon's article, that this whole rationalization of Soviet interests and wishes is a tissue of fallacies. Imperialism is a long way from dying and is grimly determined to fight to hold what it has; socialism is advancing only through bloody revolutionary strug-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gles; the whole vision of a tranquil passage from here to where we are going is nothing but a pipe dream.

To prove this to the potential revolutionaries of the world, to disabuse them of their illusions, to prepare them intellectually and morally for the struggles and sacrifices which lie ahead—this, at bottom, is what the Sino-Soviet conflict is about.

(November 12, 1963)

The Marxist school of political thought is the one most accused of arid political dogma, and indeed, being the most active in the world, it is probably the most guilty. Marx, and the school which he founded, put into the hands of the working class movement of the late nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth centuries the most complete blueprints for political action the world has ever seen. Mountains of literature have been written to prove that Marx was wrong. If that be the case, then never was error more fertile in practice. No serious student who studies the history of the last half century can deny the ferment of ideas associated with the names of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Their effectiveness in arming the minds of working class leaders all over the world with intellectual weapons showed that their teaching had an organic relationship with the political and social realities of their time.

—Aneurin Bevan, In Place of Fear

The new world revolution of the peasantry perhaps cannot properly be called a religious revolution. At the same time it is unquestionably a spiritual one. It is true that the objectives that are its first aim are of a material kind. . . . But the material foundations are a means to a spiritual end. And what could be more obviously spiritual than the awakening of hope and purposefulness and energy that is the driving force behind the whole of this glorious revolution? This driving force is the last and greatest of the revolutionary forces that have been released, all round the world, by the sound of a shot that was fired, on an April day, by embattled American farmers.

—Arnold J. Toynbee, America and the World Revolution

Our American friends are remarkable organizers and technicians and excellent soldiers. But their incontestable realism stops short of politics, where the attitude of the ostrich seems to them to be best.

—Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT: A REPLY

BY MAX GORDON

Commentators on the Sino-Soviet schism have offered various explanations—economic, geopolitical, historical, and psychological—for its genesis. They appear generally agreed that ideological differences rationalize the conflict but do not explain it. Yet ideological strife does have its own logic and impact; the fact that it rationalizes national economic or political differences does not make it any the less genuine as an expression of policy. Hence it requires examination on its own terms.

The MONTHLY REVIEW editors, being materialists, naturally —and properly—evaluate the conflict in material terms. Thus, Paul Sweezy writes (MR, May, 1962) that "we have here an example of a genuine contradiction in the world socialist system, one which has been caused by the uneven development of socialism on an international scale and is therefore inevitable. . . ." Similarly, the MR editors conclude (May, 1963) that at bottom are the conflicting economic interests of the Soviet and Chinese people.

Acceptance of the idea of a material clash of interest among socialist nations is no small matter. It suggests that yet another fundamental proposition of Marxism-Leninism (there have been several recently) has proved false; to wit, that material contradictions are exclusively a product of capitalism and that socialism knows no competitive national interests. This was the underlying theoretical assumption in the creation of a monolithic world Communist movement led by the Soviet Party, a development which may well have distorted and delayed progress toward socialism, at least in bourgeois democratic countries (as Sweezy implies in his May, 1962, article).

The author was a member of the editorial board and staff of the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* for many years until he severed his connection in 1958.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the very statement which attacks the ideology of the Soviet Communists in greatest detail and passion, the Chinese Communists assert that socialist nations "have no antagonistic contradictions."* This is a striking, if minor, demonstration of their refusal to see the world as it really exists. Edgar Snow, reporting at first hand, tells us that Mao's "grasp of the Western world is a schematic one based on Marxist analysis of classes as they exist in backward economies like the one he grew up in." (*The Other Side of the River,* p. 146.) To Americans the rigid schematism is particularly apparent in the Chinese charge that the obstacle to mass revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle here is the United States Communist Party's "prettifying" of American imperialism. (*Peking Review,* March 15, 1963.) By definition, the CP is the vanguard of the working class. Ergo America's working class is confused as a result of the CP's wrong policies here!

In the delicately balanced world of today, such adherence to dogma can be a large factor in bringing humanity to its ultimate disaster. It introduces rigidity in relations among nations where great flexibility is required, and it forces some of this rigidity upon the Russians. In this specific regard it can be as deadly as the dogmatism of the "radical Right" in our country, more so since the Chinese are so vastly more powerful.

The essence of Chinese dogma is the application of Leninist theoretical principles of 1919 to the world of today. This is done in the name of Marxism-Leninism. Since the Marxist-Leninist philosophical foundation is dialectical materialism, we have here a startling contradiction in terms. It is a negation both of dialectics and of materialism to apply to current society idealized concepts which arose out of the experience of the vastly different world of half a century ago. This is quite apart from the generally idealist methodology of the entire Communist world, which views the utterances of a single genius as sacred truth, incapable of correction or development with further knowledge and experience.

* "More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us," *Peking Review,* March 15, 1963. References to the Chinese Communist position are taken from this article and the June 14, 1963, letter to the CPSU (*New York Times,* July 5).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Specifically, the Chinese application of Lenin's 1919 propositions appears to be at variance with the real world of the 1960's in at least three major respects:

(1) Though the Chinese recognize the existence of nuclear weapons, they insist this revolution in weapons technology has no significance for the problems of war and peace, or for the relations among nations. *To a world which can be destroyed in hours, they apply the theoretical principles of a world in which four years of massive warfare could not destroy more than five percent of the peoples of the warring nations alone.*

(2) Though they assert that 40 percent of the world's population now lives under socialism, they insist that this massive historic fact has no material impact upon imperialism. *To a world deep in transition to socialism, they apply the theoretical principles of a pre-socialist world.*

(3) Though they declare that much of the former colonial world has gained liberation, they describe the political position of the peoples of this world in the same terms as Lenin. *To a world in which great empires have crumbled and more than fifty newly-independent nations have been established, they apply the theoretical principles of a world which was "divided among the great imperialist powers."*

Before noting specifically how these divergencies between dogma and reality affect world peace, let me note that some people argue that American imperialism has given the Chinese Communists good reason for their ideological position. Undoubtedly this is so. But it is irrelevant to the *objective validity* of the ideology as a reflection of the dynamics of world development—which is what ideology is supposed to be. The Chinese, after all, have been telling the Italian Communists how to behave in Italy; they seem oblivious to the patent fact that if the Italian Communists were to follow this advice, they would quickly be reduced to an insignificant, futile sect. How our State Department would love that! Nor is it relevant that the Chinese do not *act* warlike. The point of the ideological dispute is that the Chinese insist the *Russians* have the power to act that way, and are not doing it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(I) War, Peace, and the Bomb

One can properly dismiss, as the editors of MR do (October, 1963), the Soviet charge that the Chinese Communists *want* war. One cannot, however, dismiss the charge that the Chinese position tends to perpetuate the evil consequences of nuclear competition, enhances the threat of nuclear war, and undercuts efforts to reduce that threat.

The American Left, including MR, has not been behindhand in emphasizing the great danger to humanity involved in nuclear testing, weapons development, and nuclear confrontations. It has properly pictured the horrendous consequences of the Cold War atmosphere as regards not only fall-out but the psychological impact on children in particular. It cannot do this when it suits its book, and forget it when it does not. Yet the editors of MR blandly ignore the Chinese opposition to the nuclear test ban, an inherent consequence of its entire position and one which would make any limitation on testing or arms buildup a practical impossibility. As MR has noted (May, 1963) Chinese disarmament proposals are avowedly intended for propaganda purposes only.

The MR editors maintain that the real issues in the dispute are the right method to defeat imperialism (a goal not presently in sight, they confess) and the course to be followed after successful socialist revolution. This definition of the differences embodies the formal Chinese position; it dismisses the Soviet position that the real issue is the prevention of nuclear war and the development of approaches for the maintenance of peace.

In MR for February, 1963, a guest "Review of the Month" declares: "Nothing in man's past prepares him to cope with the magnitude of the problem that now confronts him—the possibility, nay the probability, of the physical destruction of the world in which he lives." This destruction can take place, independent of aggressive intent, through accident caused by the incredibly intricate mechanisms of nuclear weaponry, through escalation of "small" conflicts, through the tensions and fears of the race for ever-improved weapons systems, or through atmospheric poisoning. Explicitly and implicitly, the Chinese deny these new sources of potential war and the threat of human destruction, and they shape their ideology accordingly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They deny it explicitly by their repeated insistence that the *only* source of war danger is aggressive American imperialism. If so, plainly there is no need to safeguard against nuclear war by accident. They reinforce this denial implicitly by omitting the development of nuclear weaponry from their list of the important world changes since 1945. And they offer a series of arguments which underscore their belief in the continued viability of war as an instrument of national policy. They argue, moreover, that should a nuclear war occur it will be the end of capitalism. The reported statement by Mao, repeated from time to time by other spokesmen, that even if 300 million Chinese were killed in a nuclear war China would survive, perhaps as the only nation, may be a palatable argument for some Chinese; it is difficult to understand how it can be acceptable even to non-Chinese who accept Mao's ideology.

The Chinese insist with passion upon the applicability today of Lenin's thesis that wars are won by morale, not weapons. When Lenin advanced this thesis, the Clausewitz doctrine that there could be no such thing as a sufficiency of weapons for an army was still true. It is no longer true, and it is difficult to see how the morale of a people can be summoned for further struggle after an all-out H-bomb attack. Assuming a few survived, with what would they fight? With slingshots? To underscore their point, the Chinese quote Lord Mountbatten in 1945 and Stalin in 1946 to the effect that A-bombs will not be decisive in a war. This is startling. For it appears to have escaped the attention of the Chinese leaders that in their impact on the conduct of wars the power of the handful of A-bombs then available bears about as much relationship to the power and stockpile of nuclear weapons today as the bow and arrow to the howitzer.

The Chinese argue that the laws of social development, of the class struggle, have not ceased to operate with the emergence of nuclear weapons. Neither did they cease to operate with the emergence of fascism. Yet, the allied imperialist powers united with, and came to the aid of, the Soviet Union to prevent its destruction by the fascist axis. The Chinese Communists themselves united first with Chiang Kai-shek and then with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States in the war against the Japanese invaders. Such was the impact of fascism on the laws of social development and class struggle. I might add, too, that the laws of social development and class struggle resulted more recently in Chinese unity with more than a score of "neutral" Asian and African nations, including India, in the Bandung Conference to promote peace and national freedom. I do not know what change in these laws resulted in making this splendid unity of recently-liberated nations suddenly unsavory.

At any rate, nuclear weaponry, perhaps an even more profound phenomenon in its long-run effects upon humanity than fascism and one which might have changed the course of history had the fascists obtained it first, exerts its own influence on the laws of social development and class struggle. It will doubtless be argued that the imperialists aided the Soviet Union because it was in their own interests to do so. It is not exactly wild to assume that elimination of the possibility of nuclear destruction is likewise in the interests of the United States and other imperialist powers.

The Chinese position, then, is a profound threat to world peace not because of any alleged desire for war but because it refuses to take account of the qualitatively new hazards and consequences of war inherent in nuclear diplomacy; and because it opposes and hampers the drastic readjustments in the relations among nations essential to the reduction or removal of these hazards.

(2) Imperialism, Yesterday and Today

It is argued that the question of war and peace is determined not by the socialist nations, but by imperialism—specifically American imperialism. According to this view, an aggressive, expansionist American imperialism has replaced other Western imperialisms and is unrelentingly exploiting and oppressing the great mass of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Except for the substitution of the United States for the older imperialist masters, its character and its behavior remain the same.

To a dialectical materialist, this would be an astonishing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phenomenon if true. It suggests that such material facts as the vast increase in Soviet power and the successful liberating revolutions of the bulk of the peoples of Asia and Africa have had no influence on the character and behavior of imperialism. (We are concerned here not with *intent* but with the manner in which power is actually exercised.) It ignores the reality that imperialism no longer has a world political monopoly, and cannot behave as it did when it had it; that the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America can and do turn to the Soviet Union for economic, political, and military support (or, at times, effectively threaten to do so); and that the actions of the United States and other capitalist powers toward these areas have been necessarily and profoundly affected by this competition with the USSR.

Examples of this are legion. For example, Western capitalist powers are now compelled to assist in the capital development of industrially backward nations for the simple reason that if they do not do it, the Russians will. Such assistance in capital development was virtually *verboten* under the colonial empires. Politically, a striking illustration of the consequences of the Soviet presence and of capitalist-socialist world political competition is the inability of our government to use naked force to destroy Castro and its incapacity to strangle the Cuban people economically. Soviet capacity to assist liberation struggles after the second World War, and United States reluctance to assist in their suppression because of the developing ideological and political conflict with the USSR, were no small factor in the British and French decisions to drop resistance to many of these struggles—in some cases without cataclysmic warfare. This was almost unheard of in the days before the second World War.

Is the United States fastening its oppression upon the peoples of Asia and Africa, as the Chinese maintain, or is it conducting a desperate holding operation in a few small nations of Asia, the residue of the colonial system? Let's see. A few months ago 32 nations representing the bulk of the African people held an All-Africa Conference devoted to planning joint action for economic and social development and for completing the liberation of Africa. They specifically named Angola, Mo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zambique, and South Africa, including South-West Africa, as targets. Granted these African nations have enormous problems. Granted, too, that the United States and West European capital will try to woo them. But can it seriously be maintained that the great task before the people of Ghana or Nigeria or Guinea or Algeria is to stage a revolution against American imperialism? Or even that American imperialism bars revolutionary solutions which they may desire to apply to their problems? There was certainly no sign of this at the Conference, nor could there be.

Undoubtedly, American and European capital will try to penetrate these nations. But there is a vast gulf between a colonial people at the mercy of imperialist masters, and a free nation determining for itself whether and on what terms foreign capital will be permitted to operate. An MR article by Philip Reno ("Aluminum Profits and Caribbean People," October, 1963) describes how American aluminum interests, in partnership with the Ghana government, are building the Volta River hydro-electric project "which will make a qualitative change in the Ghanaian economy." This type of partnership, with African governments holding 51 percent of the interest, has emerged as the pattern for foreign investments. Included are contractual provisions for training indigenous personnel to replace foreign operatives at all levels in stated periods of time.

In Asia, too, it cannot be argued that American imperialism is aggressively expanding as a replacement of older imperialisms, and that anti-imperialist revolutions are something for the future. Some areas of sharp conflict with imperialism exist—in Vietnam, South Korea, Taiwan, Laos, perhaps Thailand later. But are these indications of *expansion* of imperialism or are they pockets of last-ditch imperialist resistance? American influence certainly exists in various insidious forms, including CIA subversion. But it is those who view this as dominant or overpowering who overestimate imperialist strength. Nor are American, or other, capitalists extracting super-profits today, at least from new investments, in many of these lands. Ironically, one problem in attracting new private capital from the United States is that this capital is currently bringing higher returns in Western Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are areas in which United States power is directed at maintaining domination, including the bulk of the nations of Latin America. The tactics to be pursued in relation to liberation struggles in these areas are a major source of conflict between the Chinese and the USSR. The Soviet leaders are apparently trying to operate within the framework of today's world. Their support for liberation movements seems to be conditioned by the need to prevent their escalation into major war. The Chinese are trying to exert pressure for bolder intervention on the grounds that "the imperialists will not start a nuclear war" since they know the consequences for themselves (a curious argument from those who assail reliance on the intelligence of the bourgeoisie). One is reminded of a *New York Times Magazine* article by Barry Goldwater about a year ago in which he argued for greater pressures against the Russians on the grounds that they would not start a nuclear war, knowing the consequences for themselves. Less subtle than the Chinese, he sounded strikingly like a teen-ager playing "chicken" with his car, as several *Times* letter-writers quickly pointed out.

The underlying concept at Bandung was that mobilization of world opinion by the united power of the underdeveloped nations, the mass of humanity, could compel the great powers to readjust their policies in behalf of peace and national liberation. It is a good concept. If the Chinese aim is to block American imperialism, this would appear to be a more realistic way in today's world than naked reliance on Soviet nuclear power.

(3) The Role of Independent Nations

Both the Chinese and the MR editors speak of anti-imperialist national revolutions growing into socialist revolutions directed, presumably, against their own bourgeoisie, American imperialism, and the "lackeys of imperialism." It would be useful if they specified to which nations they refer. With liberation, the former colonial countries can no longer be viewed as one amorphous mass about which generalizations can be safely made.

The bulk of the new African nations, starting to develop

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their economies from scratch, are doing it largely under government ownership of most domestic enterprises and control of all capital. Their spokesmen have clearly proclaimed that their programs are socialist and that they are passionately devoted to development of their own institutions, which will not be copies of Chinese, British, American, or Soviet institutions. It is not clear against which groupings in these nations any future anti-imperialist or socialist revolution will be directed. At this stage, the concept of a revolution modelled after the Soviet or Chinese would be associated by them not with anti-imperialism but with subversion. Their political and economic systems represent a new phenomenon in world history, and the Communist cliché that history knows no example of socialism being achieved except through dictatorship of the proletariat has no relevance for them. (Parenthetically, we might note that history also knows no example of socialism being achieved by the Soviet or Chinese path in a developed land with a democratic tradition—almost half a century after the trail-blazing.)

In several Asian nations, however, they are not building from scratch and there is substantial class stratification. Conceivably, in one or another of these countries a "profound socialist revolution" may take place some day. But as the MR editors suggest (and here they express their difference with the Chinese), this is for the distant future. Since relative American power on a world scale is plainly, and inevitably, on the wane—through the increase and development of the newly-independent nations, the recovery and economic growth of other capitalist nations, and the expansion of socialist power—it is scarcely certain that American imperialism will have the capacity to intervene decisively in that distant future. Meanwhile, one wonders why the MR editors consider the Chinese correct in the argument with the Russians. If no anti-imperialist or socialist revolutions will take place in the foreseeable future (or, at any rate, no major ones), and if they will eventuate in the end, would it not make more sense to give the underdeveloped nations the chance to mature by a policy of war prevention, by demonstrating the superiority of socialism, by assisting in their industrial growth and the development of a working class?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Latin America, of course, presents a different type of problem. But it is here that the Chinese position can be the most disastrous. Any support for revolutionary forces cannot come alone from the Soviet Union or China without a deadly confrontation. It must come from, or with the support of, an increasingly influential bloc of recently-liberated nations acting as "neutrals" in an independent fashion (not "passive," as suggested by MR's editors). The Chinese attitude of "he who is not with us is against us" is alienating these nations. The Soviet position of assisting "active neutrality" is gaining their support.

Plainly this is an extremely sketchy, and unsatisfactory, statement concerning a vast and complex matter. But it is enough, I believe, to suggest that the simplistic, sweeping formulas of the past regarding bourgeois national and socialist revolutions in "backward" countries are inadequate.

In appealing to the Chinese to quit quarreling with the Russians, MR's editors say the division between them will increase pressures here for preventive war on China. No evidence is adduced. Public discussion here on methods to exploit the split has been confined to getting some political bargains from the Russians in the give-and-take on accommodation.

An end to the schism on terms advancing world peace is to be devoutly desired. But there is also the matter of removing made-in-USA obstacles to Chinese entry into the comity of nations, thus helping to remove some causes for her distorted view of world reality. Our position on China, Chiang Kai-shek, and Taiwan makes no sense whatever, and this is bound to have its evil reflections in international relations. Hence not only must there be pressure for a Sino-Soviet rapprochement, but for one between the United States and China. It seems remote, but so does the course pleaded by MR. It is also difficult to work for if one accepts the current Chinese world view, and perhaps this was why MR's editors did not mention it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT DO THE RUSSIANS WANT?

BY KONNI ZILLIACUS

At first glance, observed the July 14th note of the Central Committee of the CPSU, commenting on the June 14th note of their Chinese opposite numbers, the Sino-Soviet controversy might look like a scholastic exercise, a dialectical tempest in a teacup. This, however, would be an error, due to the Chinese habit of twisting Marxist-Leninist texts, and particularly the resolutions of the 1957 and 1960 world congresses of Communist Parties, to suit their purposes.

In fact, the controversy raises questions of vital interest to all peoples, such as that of war and peace; of the role and development of the world socialist system; of the fight against the ideology and practice of the "personality cult"; of the strategy and tactics of the world working class movement and the anti-colonial struggle for national freedom.

The Moscow political weekly *New Times* wrote that this conflict raised issues which concern not only Communists but all mankind. Articles in the press and periodicals appeal for understanding and support of the Soviet position, not only to Communist Parties but to "progressive opinion" in general.

These declarations are a measure of the scope and seriousness in Russian eyes of their conflict with China. They see it, of course, from their own national point of view.

The Soviet Union is no longer a revolutionary, but a post-revolutionary society, which has had its fill of war, violence, and the oppression and tyranny of Stalinism, and is apprehensive about the danger of a nuclear war. It should never be forgotten that the Russian Revolution celebrated its 46th anniversary on November 7th of this year. Anyone aged 55 today was only 9 at that time, and the Revolution a vague childhood memory. Below that age, that is to the vast majority of the Soviet people,

---

Konni Zilliacus is a left-wing British Labour Party M.P. and a frequent contributor to MR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Revolution is something in history books, or that they saw on films, or heard about from their elders.

Under Lenin, "peaceful coexistence" meant first a truce between whites and reds in the Russian civil war, and next a breather between the interventionists and the infant Soviet government—he never believed the capitalist world would allow the Soviet regime to survive: either imperialism would be defeated by revolution, or the Bolshevik government would be overthrown by counter-revolutionary intervention. In Stalin's day, peaceful coexistence became an armistice of indefinite duration, during which, in the official Soviet view, there would be piecemeal revolutions in the capitalist world while Russia got on with the job of building "socialism in one country."

Khrushchev's conception of peaceful coexistence and its relation to revolution starts with the belief that the "socialist camp," with two fifths of the world's industrial power and over one third of its population, with vast natural resources and including one of the two world powers with nuclear armaments sufficient to destroy the other in case of war, can exert a decisive influence on world affairs, both economically and politically. He wants urgently an agreement on disarmament, a great expansion of East-West trade, cultural relations, and freedom of travel, as part of this conception of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet notes blame the Chinese for "pessimism" about the possibility of the socialist camp's influencing events by peaceful means. The Chinese, say the Russians, ignore the power of the working class in the Western countries. They do not understand the relation between peaceful coexistence and revolution, and between the Cold War and reaction. They have no faith in

> the capacity of socialist countries to defeat capitalism in economic competition. . . . They do not see the possibility of exerting influence on the international revolutionary movement, principally through economic successes, through the example of successful building of socialism in their own countries. . . .
>
> Again, what situation is more favorable to the revolutionary struggle of the working class in capitalist countries—peace and peaceful coexistence, or permanent international tension and "Cold War"? There is no doubt at all about the answer to this question.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who does not know that the Cold War is exploited by the rulers of the imperialist countries in order to whip up chauvinism, war hysteria, and fanatical anti-Communism, in order to put the worst reactionaries and pro-fascists in power, to get rid of democracy, to abolish political parties, trade unions, and other mass organizations of the working class? (Soviet note in *Pravda,* September 21-22).

This argument is developed at considerable length: the Chinese overlook the fact that the colonial peoples cannot win in their fight for freedom without the massive support of the workers in the advanced industrial nations. Nor, having achieved national political independence, can they take the next step and gain economic independence by taking over their natural resources and big business, without material and technical aid from, and guaranteed markets in, the advanced industrial countries. At this stage, elements of the national bourgeoisie in the newly independent colonies will side with the foreign capitalists in their countries on class grounds, and it will become more than ever difficult to separate the struggle for colonial freedom from the class struggle in the Western countries. The two are different aspects of one and the same struggle, and the leaders of one can succeed only in conjunction with the success of the other.

The Chinese are accused of trying to separate the anti-colonial liberation movement from the class struggle of the international working class and, in so doing, of hobnobbing with reactionary governments, as in Pakistan against neutral India. The Sino-Indian clash is a very sore point with the Russians, who hold the Chinese chiefly responsible and say they have done incalculable damage to the Indian Communist Party, working-class and progressive forces generally, and have greatly strengthened Indian militarism and reaction. The Soviet press even cites cases of Chinese appeals to anti-white racialism, not only in ex-colonial countries, but in one case, in talking with a Big Business delegation from Japan!

Perhaps the strongest Russian criticism of the Chinese position is on the issue of the test-ban treaty and nuclear weapons. Chinese attacks on the former, say the Russians, are explained by their desire to obtain the latter. Quotations from Chinese views on these matters in the Soviet notes and press comments

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make a pretty convincing case for this view, and were confirmed on October 29th by British press reports of an interview given to Japanese journalists in Peking by Marshal Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, who explained that because of the backward state of her industry it would take China years to explode an atomic bomb, and longer still before she could go into mass production of nuclear weapons.

> However, [ran the report of this interview] China would have to explode a nuclear bomb within a few years or run the risk of degenerating into a second-class or third-class power. Marshal Chen Yi attacked the recent nuclear test-ban treaty which, he said, was aimed at making assaults on a nation which might want to conduct tests in the future.

The Russians deride the Chinese argument that nuclear weapons in the hands of socialist states would be a guarantee of peace, whereas the more capitalist states acquired them the greater would be the danger of war, and their apparent belief that the Soviet Union should have supplied China with the know-how to make an atomic bomb, while at the same time opposing the idea of the United States doing the same with regard to their allies. "What sort of a figure would we cut," asked a Soviet note, "if we were to pass you over bombs with one hand while with the other trying to stop the Americans doing the same to their allies?" Moreover, whereas China possessed neither the industrial capacity nor technical knowledge to produce nuclear weapons, and the attempt to do so would overstrain her economy, the West Germans and Japanese could convert American know-how into mass production of nuclear weapons very quickly. Would this serve the cause of peace?

A further Russian argument is that they already have all the nuclear weapons necessary to defend the socialist camp and that the Chinese demand for nuclear weapons of their own shows that the Chinese government either doubts that the USSR will keep her word or intends to involve the Soviet Union in a nuclear war on occasions when the Soviet government thinks the issue could and should be settled by compromise and negotiation. (The parallel with de Gaulle's attitude to the United States and vice versa is striking—even to the Chinese

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposal to get rid of all nuclear weapons in the world as a condition for giving up their announced intention to make themselves a nuclear power.)

The Russians, of course, do not believe that the conflict has arisen because of differing views as to the course of world history in the next decade or so, nor even because the Chinese desire to go to any lengths to support revolutions in other countries. They point out that Chinese prudence and patience in regard to Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan, which the Russians highly commend, contrast markedly with Chinese verbal violence about what the Russians ought to have done in Cuba, or the Congo, or other remote parts of the world, and with the Chinese contention that the Russians should be much tougher and more intransigent because the "imperialists" are monolithic blocks of aggression and bad faith who understand nothing but force. Their threat of nuclear war, say the Chinese, is a paper tiger—and even if there were a nuclear war, a third or more of mankind might survive to build a future a thousand times more splendid on the radioactive ashes of civilization and most of humanity.

The trouble started, say the Russians, when the Chinese made a mess of their "great leap." The Russians warned them that their calculations were unrealistic and bound to fail. One Soviet note pointed out that the Chinese had reckoned on increasing steel production in five years from 5 million tons to between 80 and 100 million tons; in the same period, overall industrial production was to increase 6½ times and agricultural production 2½. Payment in the "communes" was not to be on the socialist principle of "to each according to his contribution," but "to each according to his need," so that the man who worked little got as much as he who worked hard. After their shortcut to Communism had turned out to be a blind alley, the Chinese blamed the Russians for their failure: Soviet help had been woefully insufficient. The Soviet Government had turned down the Chinese request to halt the 7-year plan for a year in order to devote all Soviet productive resources over and above current needs to providing the Chinese with what they needed.

The Chinese complaint about the withdrawal of the Soviet

(*continued on page* 450)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

CHRISTMAS PRICES SLASH

All Cloth Bound Books Unless Otherwise Noted

34. BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders. Preface by Bertrand Russell and foreword by Robert Jungk. A must book for everybody interested *in peace.*
LIST $4.00 _____ SPECIAL $1.50

35. FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray. The arguments of both sides explained and evaluated. Gives the reader a new understanding of the nature of the conflict, where we stand, and where we are going. Contains the complete texts of the most crucial documents.
LIST $8.50 _____ SPECIAL $4.00

36. THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley. The life and times of Chu Teh, a stirring biography woven into the context of the Chinese Revolution.
LIST $6.75 _____ SPECIAL $3.00

37. THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND CASTRO by William Appleman Williams. Clearly-reasoned, penetrating study by the well-known Wisconsin Professor of History. A must for anyone interested in Cuba.
LIST $3.25 _____ SPECIAL $2.00

38. THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX by Stanley Moore. An analysis of tensions and conflicts in Marx's theories connected with the quarrels over tactics that have split each generation of Marxists since the death of Engels. Traces back to Marx some of the issues currently dividing Khrushchev, Mao, and Tito.
LIST $2.25 _____ SPECIAL $1.25

39. NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams. The "unwritten" social history of the Southwest—its agricultural, industrial, and economic beginnings with special emphasis on the Spanish-speaking minority.
LIST $5.00 _____ HALF PRICE $2.50

40. THE LIFE AND IDEAS OF ROBERT OWEN by A. L. Morton. A general account of the life and work of Robert Owen, the founder of British Cooperation and Socialism, through his own writings and works.
LIST $3.50 _____ SPECIAL $2.00

41. THE RAGGED TROUSERED PHILANTHROPISTS by Robert Tressell. A great novel of the working class which has become *a classic.*
LIST $6.00 _____ HALF PRICE $3.00

42. PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray. The relationship of patriotism to capitalism, socialism, communism, and civil liberties examined with incisive logic. Brilliantly written.
LIST $4.00 _____ ONLY $1.00

43. WELLINGTON ROAD by Margaret Lasell. The journal of the six months Mrs Lassell lodged with an English working cla family on relief. "I found it utterly e *thralling, deeply moving and nightmaris* beyond anything by Dante or any of th other purveyors of the horrors of huma existence."—Malcolm Muggeridge
LIST $3.75 _____ SPECIAL $1.0

44. WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harve O'Connor. A survey of the world industr Every country that is an oil producer treated separately with all the pertinent fact and figures on production, management, ow ership, rivalries of the past, and conflic to come.
LIST $7.50 _____ HALF PRICE $3.7

45. CASTE, CLASS, & RACE by Oliver Co Reprint of a classic contribution to sociolog cal theory. Winner of the George Washing ton Carver Award.
LIST $7.50 _____ SPECIAL $4.0

46. CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cocl burn. Very funny book by the former edito of The Week. "The most engaging of hi torians, the most persuasive of storyteller the liveliest gadfly of an age."
—Times Literary Supplemer
LIST $3.50 _____ ONLY $1.0

47. VIEW FROM THE WEST by Clau Cockburn. "The main thing to be said abou this book is that it is vintage Cockburn astringently witty, sardonically perceptive the prose a delight to read."—Sunday Time (London)
LIST $3.75 _____ SPECIAL $2.0

48. THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Brader Gets to the heart of the segregation ques tion. Voted "one of the best books of 1958 by a poll of booksellers and librarian "Will live to become a classic on th southern situation."—Rev. Martin Luther Kin
LIST $5.00 _____ ONLY $2.0

49. PAPERBACK SPECIAL
NINE MR paperbacks in history, economics, sociology, and current affairs which make an ideal gift package.
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—Boggs
WHITHER LATIN AMERICA?—Carlos Fuentes and others
CAPITALISM YESTERDAY & TODAY—Dobb
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN—Pappenheim
AMERICAN RADICALS—Goldberg, ed.
AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE—Cochran, ed.
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS—Huberman
CUBA: ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION—Huberman & Sweezy
THE PRESENT AS HISTORY—Sweezy
LIST $13.65 _____ BARGAIN $10.00

All orders must be postmarked not later than D

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OOK SALE
) UP TO 77%

Ideal Christmas Gifts

TIDE WITHOUT TURNING by John Gill. ire the Civil War, the battle against -re slavery was waged by the Abolition- Elijah Lovejoy fought for the right to t their side in his newspaper. He was hed by a mob. This book tells the drama- story of Elijah Lovejoy and his fight for dom of the press.
T $4.50 _____ BARGAIN $1.00

I. THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN UBA by J. P. Morray. A graduate of e U.S. Naval Academy, the author pent 21 months in Cuba studying the uban Revolution. Shows how the de- elopment of the Cuban Revolution after anuary, 1959, changed the ideology and haracter of the regime to one of so- ialism and Marxism-Leninism.
IST $3.25 _____ SPECIAL $2.00

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF OWTH by Paul A. Baran. Professor Baran cerns himself with how each society erates and utilizes its economic surplus. as the transition from feudalism to italism was marked by tremendous up- vals, so can the present turmoil in the rld be understood only as the reflection similar processes. ". . . an imposing vey of the major problems inherent in nomic development."
—The Saturday Review
T $5.00 _____ HALF PRICE $2.50

53. A PHILOSOPHY OF MAN by Adam Schaff. One of the leading intellectuals of the socialist world examines the theory of Existentialism. An exploration of the nature of the "eternal problems" of human happi- ness, freedom, and responsibility.
LIST $3.25 _____ SPECIAL $2.25

54. THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE: GERMANY FROM HITLER TO ADENAUER by Heinz Abosch. Relates the development of German society since the war to the economic, social, and moral problems of our time.
LIST $5.00 _____ HALF PRICE $2.50

55. SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY by Deana Levin. An English educator, the author went to Russia and became a teacher in Moscow. "It tells much more about Russia, its hard- ships and achievements, than any book I have read for a long time."—Jennie Lee
LIST $4.00 _____ HALF PRICE $2.00

56. POLITICS AND LAW IN SOUTH AFRI- CA by Julius Lewin. Eight essays by a lawyer on the faculty of the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg who has spe- cialized in African studies.
LIST $2.95 _____ SPECIAL $2.00

7. REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHER POEMS by John Beecher. This andsome book of poems is a collector's item. The MR Press edition, photo offset from ie original which sold in numbered and signed copies for $10, is a beautiful Xmas gift.
IST PRICE $3.00 _____ HALF PRICE $1.50

ggested order form below. Please be sure to enclose correct payment with name d address printed plainly.

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

Enclosed find $_____. Please rush to me, postage paid, the selections circled below.

34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45

46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

1. Titles go up to list price again on January 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from page* 447)

technicians is met by the charge that the Chinese had paid no attention to their advice and had in fact wrecked the Soviet machinery—some of the best and most modern the USSR had—by trying to make their factories produce twice what their Russian advisers told them was possible. Moreover, say the Russians, although it was too much to ask of the Soviet people that they should halt the 7-year plan for a whole year, we did give the Chinese all the help we could, and built and equipped dozens of factories for them, sending our top experts to show them how to use our machinery.

One Russian, who is both a writer and a political figure, admitted that wounded national pride had a great deal to do with the Chinese attitude—they were kept out of the United Nations, not recognized and boycotted by many nations, subjected to chronic cold aggression by the United States from Taiwan, menaced by American hot aggression in South Vietnam and Laos, and deprived of any way of keeping their end up in world affairs except by making a nuisance of themselves.

To sum up: both sides are conducting a controversy, arising out of conflicting national needs and purposes, in terms of rival interpretations of Marxist-Leninist doctrines, and particularly the resolutions of the 1957 and 1960 Communist Party world congresses. Power and a sense of responsibility generally go together; hence the Chinese caution and realism when it comes to imperialism on their doorstep, and verbal violence and extremism in supporting revolutions in remote parts of Asia, not to mention Africa and Latin America, where they have no power to influence events. This is partly due to the Chinese revolution's still being in its manic phase, to wounded national pride, and to the fact that, as one Russian put it to me, "the Chinese are extremely numbers-conscious"—they are a quarter of the human race and have traditions going back 3,000 years or more, and they are determined to make their voice heard in the world. That, say the Russians, is a legitimate demand, and that is why it is criminal folly to exclude China from her proper place in the UN.

The Russians, on the other hand, are a post-revolutionary world power which is much more concerned to preserve world

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace than to promote revolutions in other countries. They look on the Chinese as the long-range "Malcolm X's" of the anti-colonial struggle, who would gladly incite distant Asians, Latin Americans, or Africans to seize arms, provoke American or other intervention, and die gloriously on the barricades, with the support of mass meetings in Peking but without any possibility of the Chinese giving any material help to those who followed their advice, or being held responsible for the consequences. Whereas the Russians, who would be expected to back words by deeds and would certainly be held accountable, take a much more cautious and realistic view: they think time is on the side of the revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but that the decisive moment for them will come only when the internal resistance to imperialism in Western countries has become powerful enough to stop them going to war to suppress revolutions.

The Soviet notes and press comments insist again and again that revolution is the internal affair of the countries concerned, and can take place in many ways; peaceful, violent, and mixed, and not only by armed conflict, as the Chinese seem to think. Contrary to popular belief, the Soviet Communists, who made their revolution and laid the foundations of socialism not only unaided but in the teeth of the more or less violent hostility of the whole capitalist world, have always held that it is for the workers and their allies in each country to do the job for themselves.

While the Russians will oppose the export of counter-revolution by the West, they will not themselves attempt to export revolution. That is, they will give all the material and technical aid they can to revolutionary governments and help them to resist foreign intervention or, at an earlier stage, will oppose policies such as that of the United States in South Vietnam and South Korea to prop up or impose reaction. But they will not risk a nuclear showdown except in defense of themselves or of an ally. Moreover, say the Russians, the more reasonable we are, the more will grow the forces of internal resistance, based on the working class, to Western imperialism, and the sooner there will be a politically effective

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand for peaceful coexistence, which is necessary for the success of the forces of social change and colonial freedom alike.

Whereas non-official Russians tend to take the view that the breach is irreparable, those in authority hold that, although it will take time, reason and the logic of facts will in the end prevail, and there will be a reconciliation between the two great countries which have such overwhelmingly powerful reasons to be friends and partners. Meanwhile, they warn, any would-be aggressor should have no illusion about the fact that any attacks on China would find her Soviet ally at her side.

The scientist looked into the hell of the bomb long before anybody else did. One of the things that trouble me is that nobody believes us when we predict the hell, and that even the responses we scientists make to the hell, both inside and outside government, are not appropriate to the magnitude of that hell. I think it is obvious now that weapons are completely out of proportion, that they no longer have any function as a continuation of foreign policy.

—*Hans Bethe, Science*

What is growth—is it getting bigger or getting better? What is a good standard of living, more things to consume or better things to appreciate and discriminate? Which is the better use of the moon: to hit it with a rocket or just to look at it? Where are the frontiers of human enterprise? Should people build and pioneer always outward or sometimes inward?

—*Robert Redfield, Talk With a Stranger*

There has been a corrosive effect on white America's mental health as a result of evading the problem of race discrimination for three hundred years. What does this say about the present state of American mental health, and what bearing does this deep-seated guilt and this deep-seated fear have on the American character?

—*William Worthy, The American Character*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SHAME OF OKINAWA

BY JAMES M. DIAMOND

Okinawa is the former southernmost Prefecture of Japan proper—that is, of Japan minus the territory she acquired in the fifty years starting with the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895. Near the end of the Second World War it was the site of a tremendous air, sea, and land battle which resulted in the first of three great wounds to the Japanese nation which forced its surrender. The three—the other two were of course Hiroshima and Nagasaki—are comparable in the number of deaths: 150,000 Japanese died in the prolonged Battle of Okinawa, including one in eight of the civilian population.

After the restoration of peace between the United States and Japan, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were dedicated to peace and memorials were built there. The dead of Hiroshima were told: "Rest in Peace. No, never again." By way of contrast, Okinawa was annexed by the United States and a mighty military base, housing the most extensive nuclear arsenal in Asia, was constructed there. The traditional vaulted tombs of Okinawa came to be considered by the population not as memorials but as potential bomb shelters.

In Japan, both the memory of Hiroshima-Nagasaki, 1945, and the present reality of Okinawa motivate workers for peace. Strange to say, then, that the symbol which is more indicative of America's *current* guilt in Asia—and which in any case ought to have a prior claim on the attention of Americans by virtue of the fact that it is actually ruled by a United States military dictatorship—has been almost completely ignored in this country. It is of course natural that Japanese who oppose A- and H-bombs oppose the stockpiling of these weapons on Okinawa, that is, on their own soil. It seems unnatural to me that Americans who are similarly opposed to nuclear weapons and to their proliferation manage to say almost nothing at all about Okinawa, where

---

The author is an American residing in Japan.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these frightful instruments of death and destruction are deployed, as we shall show, against non-nuclear countries, that is, aggressively rather than for purposes of deterrence.

The failure of American peace groups to deal with Okinawa is especially glaring when one realizes that restrictions imposed on travel by the United States military regime on Okinawa prevent Japanese peace workers from visiting the island and keep Okinawan peace workers prisoner. Only Americans are free to travel to Okinawa and at the same time to tell the world what they see there. To shirk this responsibility is to act the jailer.

The present article is based on a personal visit to Okinawa undertaken in a private capacity during my residence in Japan, and on numerous interviews with Okinawans and with Japanese who are interested in Japan's Okinawa problem. I hope that it will convince others that Americans who want peace must accept as allies one million Okinawans who want democracy.

Okinawa is governed by Executive Order 10713, issued by President Eisenhower in 1957 and later modified slightly by E. O. 11010 issued by President Kennedy in 1962. The E. O. provides, among other things, that the Secretary of Defense name a member of the armed forces to act as High Commissioner (Hicom) of the Ryukyu Islands,* that the Hicom have authority to promulgate laws by fiat and remove any public official from office, that he maintain a system of courts to whose jurisdiction he may transfer any case at any stage of the proceedings, and that (if he should be so extraordinarily inept as to need more power) he "may assume, in whole or in part, the exercise of full authority in the islands."

Since the Secretary of Defense always picks the commanding general of the United States Forces in Okinawa to be High Commissioner, the "Civil Administration" which the Hicom heads is assured the most intimate cooperation of the armed forces and, especially important, of the military police and intelligence agencies. His leverage is economic as well as military,

* Presently Lieut. General Paul W. Caraway, and always a three-star general.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Department of Defense operates water, oil, and electricity monopolies, owns the Ryukyu Development Loan Corporation, and has a controlling share in the Bank of the Ryukyus (by far the largest bank). Of all these monopolies, the credit monopoly has been the most useful. For instance, when the capital city elected the chairman of the People's Party as its mayor, the Bank of the Ryukyus promptly froze previously granted credits of over a million dollars. A new election had to be held after this man was removed; and the president of the bank promised during the campaigning that, should the conservative candidate win, the funds would be immediately restored. These monopolies, by the way, earn profits greater than the amount of United States "foreign aid" to Okinawa.

About 300 Ordinances and Proclamations have been issued by the military regime (not to mention Directives and Orders), and many have been amended more than a dozen times. I will mention only two. The "Code of Penal Law and Procedure" (CA Ordinance 144) provides, among other things, the death penalty for bearing arms against United States forces or for "subversive activities" against the Civil Administration; ten years imprisonment for inciting to insurrection against the Civil Administration; five years for *possession* of weapons (including such weapons as are allowed 12-year-olds in most neighborhoods in the United States); five years for *possession* of a "seditious" or "libelous" manuscript; two years for making maps, sketches, or pictures of United States installations (which take up a quarter of the island); six months for publishing without a permit. "Establishment of the Okinawan Government" (Proclamation 13) provides for an Okinawan government whose Chief Executive is an appointed agent of the Hicom and whose Legislature can make no laws without Hicom approval.

The claim that the United States has a right to rule in Okinawa is preposterous but, not surprisingly, legally sound. It was engineered by a good lawyer, a Mr. J. F. Dulles, in Chapter II, Article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan. Here, the United States proclaimed its right to propose United Nations trusteeships for various Japanese islands, including the islands of Okinawa Prefecture, and further stated that "pending the making of such a proposal and affirmative action thereon, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters." The making of such a proposal is still "pending."

Parenthetically, we may note that, while the idea of such a proposal was always outrageous (since the Okinawans are a very literate and highly able people), a trusteeship became absolutely impossible and in fact illegal as soon as Japan was admitted to the United Nations, for Article 78 of the UN Charter states that "the trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become members of the United Nations."*

Article 3 thus means that the United States will keep "all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction" *forever*. It cannot mean anything else. Thus we see that Okinawa has truly been annexed by our government. Our nation has no temporary, no conditional rights in Okinawa (as is often said); it is ruling the Japanese people of Okinawa by virtue of an annexationist peace, by right of conquest.

Okinawa has few natural resources and a fantastic population density (more than double that of the rest of Japan). The United States took it not for economic exploitation but in order to use it as a military base. Nonetheless, construction of the base itself was an economic disaster for Okinawa. Twenty-five percent of Okinawa's only significant natural resource—arable land—was diverted from agricultural to military use. The mass, and at first uncompensated, expropriation of the lands of tens of thousands of poor farmers was of course a great atrocity.** Bulldozers pushed the peasants off the land whole

* That Okinawa is a territory which is a member of the United Nations is implicit in an official Statement by the President of the United States which recognizes that Okinawa is "a part of the Japanese homeland" as well as by numerous other assertions by the United States that Japan retains "residual sovereignty."

** The United States, after first expropriating the land and then trying for many years to buy title for unacceptably small amounts, finally agreed to pay annual compensation in 1957. The U.S. Forces call these compensation payments "rent" and have renounced their title to the land in favor of unrestricted "leases" which are to run indefinitely. The "rents" are a mere pittance, less than $5 million a year or $20 apiece for the 250,000 members of peasant families directly affected.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

villages at a time, while their crops and dwellings were immediately destroyed. But the suffering caused to individuals by the appropriation of their land is only part of the story, for the necessity to import food while having nothing to export in return for it has made the economy extremely dependent on foreign funds—on foreign investments, outlays by the United States Forces, and expenditures by individual servicemen. This dependence is now expressed in the overwhelming and growing prostitution of the economy. Cinerama, pizza parlors and bowling alleys, stores where luxuries such as leather goods, perfume, cameras, and diamonds are sold tax free, long rows of servicemen's bars, and great acreage devoted to sugar for export, characterize the new Okinawa, an Okinawa whose economy is no longer an instrument to meet the needs of its inhabitants. To an ever increasing extent, the Okinawans themselves are forced to work for foreigners and to import their means of livelihood. Between 1955 and 1960, the Net National Product (NNP) of the island rose from $123.1 million to $183.2 million, or by just under 50 percent. At the same time, however, the trade deficit (excess of imports over exports) increased from $43.3 million to $100.7 million, or by 133 percent. The trade deficit, in other words, rose from 35 percent of NNP to 55 percent, which may be taken as a rough indication of the increased extent to which Okinawans had to work for foreigners in order to pay for their imports.

A parallel development has been taking place in agriculture, where, in a manner typical of colonial countries, resources have been increasingly diverted from production of domestically consumed foodstuffs to commercial export crops. In the fiscal years 1958 through 1962, the value of exports of molasses, black sugar, and centrifugal sugar has shown the following phenomenal increase:

1958	$ 2,005,000
1959	10,012,000
1960	10,469,000
1961	18,828,000
1962	26,317,000

This is certainly fantastic in a country that is land-poor and must import its basic foodstuffs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How much Okinawans have benefited from the rise in their Net National Product may perhaps be gauged from the fact that the dollar value of per capita food expenditures (including some food eventually consumed by United States troops or tourists in restaurants) actually declined from 1955 to 1960 (from $68.45 to $67.15), while during the same years the food price index rose by no less than 26 percent. It is obvious that the total diet of Okinawans has been deteriorating.*

To sum up: Okinawa has been transformed into a colony not only in the sense that it is ruled by a foreign power but also from the standpoint of the country's economic enslavement and the living conditions of the people.

A look at the map shows why seizure of Okinawa from Japan and of the means of livelihood from Okinawans was undertaken by the United States military establishment. A chain of islands 200 to 400 miles off the Chinese coast and some 600 miles in extent which pickets most of the major Chinese ports (the only other exits from the Yellow Sea and the East China Sea are through the Tsushima Straits or the Formosa Strait), Okinawa is obviously possessed of great strategic importance for any military offensive against China, whether blockade, bombardment, or the landing of troops or supplies.

Of course the United States claims that Okinawa is not an offensive base at all, that it is solely defensive. I would like here to examine this claim, not with respect to the participation of Okinawa-based forces in Asian civil wars (earlier in Korea and at present in Vietnam), but with respect to the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Okinawa's arsenal includes atomic cannon, atomic and hydrogen bombs (which Okinawa's F-105 fighter-bombers can carry to their targets at twice the speed of sound), and intermediate-range ballistic missiles. This force, by the way, is sup-

* Per capita food expenditure rose to $73.75 in 1961, but the fact that over $13 million were disbursed as prepayments for military use of land during that year made it atypical. All figures cited in this article are extracted from publications of the United States Civil Administration in the Ryuku Islands, and their source is in all cases the Officer of the Comptroller. It is worth noting that USCAR publications are *not* available from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plemented by units in the Philippines, Formosa, and Korea which have nuclear weapons, and by the Seventh Fleet which carries more than a hundred aircraft equipped with atomic and hydrogen bombs.

No doubt all Americans can appreciate how jittery this huge thermonuclear force concentrated off their shores makes the Chinese, for we all remember the psychosis which was the American reaction to a much lesser force installed in Cuba in October, 1962. But it is remarkable that neither the public nor the peace movement nor even any substantial part of the leadership of the peace movement has seriously challenged the notion that these forces are defensive in nature. Apparently we have got so used to the notion that our nuclear power is a "deterrent" that we are willing to believe that any threat which our government makes with thermonuclear weapons, any and every deployment of nuclear power, is an act of "deterrence"—even when the threats and deployment are directed against non-nuclear countries! This is obviously the sheerest nonsense.

The Mace B intermediate-range missile program in Okinawa is the clearest example of the aggressive deployment of American nuclear power, since it is obvious that this particular delivery system can be used only to attack a non-nuclear country. Given the missile's range and a glance at the map, the point is irrefutably made.

The range of these missiles* includes the whole coastline of China, and, in addition, the whole coastline of North Vietnam and of North Korea. Also in range are most of the major cities and military targets in these countries. And, one may then ask, how much of the Soviet Union is in range? Perhaps a few miles

* Set at about a thousand miles when the controversy over their deployment first arose, the range has since been said to be somewhat greater. Thus *Missiles and Rockets* magazine noted that the "[Mace] B model has 1,000 mile range" (March 7, 1960), just a couple of months before news of the Mace program broke in Okinawa. But in reporting the program to the American people (March 13, 1961), it called the range "over 1,200 miles." *Spacecraft and Missiles of the World* (Barr and Howard), published in 1962, gives the range as more than 1,375 miles.

While I believe that the increased estimates of range, taking in a small corner of the Soviet Union, were probably produced by the Air Force to be more misleading than accurate, my argument is based on the assumption that the true range is anywhere from 1200 to 1500 miles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the coast of Primorsk—an obvious accident since any Okinawan IRBM program planned for use against Soviet targets would use one of the several available missiles of greater range which might reach the ICBM pads said to be on Sakhalin Island, the border with Manchuria, etc. (The chance, by the way, that a Mace could even reach the one Soviet target which may technically be in range—Vladivostok—is very slight, for it would have to fly in a straight line on a predictable course over the open sea for two hours, and its ceiling and speed are both far less than those of modern jet interceptors.)

So far as I know, no one has ever pretended that Mace B could ever be used for anything else than to devastate China. The March 13, 1961, article in *Missiles and Rockets* which lifted the veil of silence with which the program had previously been "covered" by the American press, asserted that "military planners say the Mace requirement developed because there is no adequate substitute for having a sizable heavy nuclear strike force 350 miles off the China coast." What the military planners may be planning when there is no substitute for having a sizable heavy nuclear strike force 350 miles off the coast of an underdeveloped, non-nuclear country should raise the hair on every thinking head.

It goes without saying that military dictatorship is a form of government far from rare in the "Free" World: it is well known that the United States and its Department of Defense support many such. But Okinawa is unique; and because of its uniqueness, it is admirably suited to be a symbol of the policy of fostering and furthering such dictatorships. There is no local stooge here, no Chiang or Park or Diem, to take the blame. The great difference between Okinawa and other United States-supported dictatorships is that the others fly their own flags while Okinawa flies only ours. The United States cannot disclaim its responsibility short of terminating its rule.

Okinawa also symbolizes the relationship between Washington's rule and Washington's aggression abroad. It was frankly admitted by President Kennedy, in his "Statement by the President of the United States" which accompanied Executive Order 11010 (March 19, 1962), that what he called the "military

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperative for continued United States administration" derives from the fact that American military policies are not acceptable to the sovereign people of Japan. Neither, I have no doubt, are they acceptable to the majority of Americans, who are prevented from acquiring a full knowledge of them by hypocrisy or (as in the case of the Mace program) by silence. Thus our Okinawa colony symbolizes the defeat not only of Japanese sovereignty but also of American sovereignty at the hands of our own military.

MR PRESS

BUY NOW AND SAVE . . .

PUERTO RICO: FREEDOM AND POWER IN THE CARIBBEAN

by Gordon K. Lewis

The author, currently Associate Professor in the College of Social Sciences at the University of Puerto Rico, portrays in scholarly detail the realities of modern Puerto Rico. This book is, beyond doubt, the definitive work on the subject.

Price on publication in December—$10.00
Prepublication price —$ 5.00

THE MAN AT THE DOOR WITH THE GUN

by Cedric Belfrage

A sightseeing tour of many Latin American countries by a newspaperman who shows the reader sights that are not on the usual tourist's agenda. The Man At The Door is the revolutionary of Latin America who can—and will—use his gun to set off a continental explosion.

photographs, 256 pp.

Price on publication in December—$ 4.50
Prepublication price —$ 2.50

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to
Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

The Test Ban Treaty

Millions of words were spoken and written during the latter half of 1963 in praise of the Test Ban Treaty. Parties to the treaty agree not to carry on nuclear tests in the atmosphere nor in "any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted."

Representatives of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States initialed the treaty in Moscow. Since this initialing in July, more than a hundred nations have endorsed the treaty.

Statesmen, scientists, scholars, journalists, and peace workers have joined in declaring (1) that a thaw is loosening the ice-jam of the cold war; (2) that an end to the East-West deadlock is in sight; (3) that the Test Ban Treaty is a very important step along the peace path; and (4) that other steps will be taken easily and quickly. Underlying these four propositions is the quite universal assumption that treaties will bring peace.

Treaties Old and New

Treaties are older than history. When written records first appeared, leaders and rulers were making agreements when it pleased them and breaking the agreements which had ceased to promote the interests of the treaty-makers.

Treaties serve many purposes. They declare peace and friendship among neighboring nations and peoples; they regulate political, economic, and social intercourse between nations; they create alliances and power blocs; they restore broken international contacts; they provide for a division of the spoils of war.

Foreign offices and diplomatic representatives spend a great part of their energies in drawing up and discussing agreements designed to promote the interests of their respective nations. Times change; tensions develop; arguments grow hot; diplomatic relations are strained, then broken off. If war comes, political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaties between the belligerent states are scrapped. Thus treaties, which are an important part of the laws of peace, are replaced or suspended by the competitive violence of war.

Treaties Are Instruments of Policy

Treaties, like war, are instruments of policy. They can be made when policy-makers feel or think them useful. They can be terminated at will by one or more of the nations that have signed them. There is no duly constituted authority in the present-day world competent to punish treaty violation.

Generally, in the past, wars have led to conquest, subjugation, dismemberment, or absorption of the vanquished. If the vanquished are permitted to survive, war is followed by a peace conference during which new agreements are made and new treaties signed.

Historically, treaties have marked the end of hostilities in the same sense that a declaration of war ends the life of a treaty between the belligerents.

A Step Toward World War III

The Test Ban Treaty is one step along the present war-peace cycle. It is a step toward World War III.

Military theorists define "peace" as the interval between wars. From this viewpoint peace treaties and wars are links in the chain of written history.

Since shooting war stopped in 1945 and cold war began in 1946, no important changes have been made in the institutions of Western society. War-making still is one of the most important of Western institutions.

If history follows its customary course, the interval between World Wars II and III, like that between World Wars I and II will be filled by peace talk, the revamping of alliances, and war preparations. The Test Ban Treaty has its logical place in this pattern.

The Test Ban Treaty—One Among Many

The Test Ban Treaty, however, is something more than a resumption of interrupted diplomatic relations. It expresses a hope, widely held since the outbreak of hostilities in July, 1914,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that war could be abandoned as an instrument of policy. The Test Ban Treaty is not a declaration of peace, but a token form of armament limitation. As such it is one phase of a policy that may lead, not to a new war, but toward further arms limitation.

Beginning with the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, limitations on war have been discussed and agreed upon: limitations on the type of weapons, on the rights of non-combatants, on the status of neutrals, on the treatment of prisoners. Behind these fragmentary limitations on the conduct of war lay the much broader program of general disarmament, which, in its turn, may be considered a step toward the ultimate abolition of war.

Three notable documents were written during the half century that followed the Hague Conferences. The first was the League of Nations Covenant of 1919; the second, the Peace Pact of 1928; the third was the Charter of the United Nations, adopted in 1945. Each of these steps was marked by formal, solemn treaty-making.

The League of Nations Covenant began: "The High Contracting Parties, in order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war. . . ." Many other words followed this introduction, but every nation that joined the League accepted the obligation "not to resort to war."

Nine years after the League of Nations was launched on January 10, 1920, the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact was proclaimed. By 1930, sixty-one nations had accepted the Pact, which condemned recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounced war as an instrument of national policy, and agreed that the settlement of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or origin, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Under Article I of the United Nations Charter, the member nations agreed "to maintain international peace and security," "for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace," "for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace," and "to bring about by peaceful means . . . adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All three documents contained other anti-war and pro-peace words and phrases. Beside these three outstanding examples of multilateral agreements to eschew war as a means of enforcing national policies, scores of bilateral treaties of peace and friendship have been drawn up and formally signed during the past half century. Despite these many peace protestations and solemn promises not to make war, in every year since 1911 shooting wars have been waged in some part of the world. Twice, in 1914 and 1939, these local wars expanded into general war. (The last non-war year was fifty-three years ago, 1910.) During this most recent half century, wars small and great have followed or paralleled one another in unending succession. In the intervals between wars, treaties were made only to be discarded or suspended at the outbreak of new hostilities. Western man is still living through a period during which treaties punctuate the intervals between wars.

Treaties Are Not Ensuring Peace Today

The many treaties drawn up and signed by representatives of practically all governments between 1870 and 1963 have not prevented war. Rather they have been among the preparatory steps that led to armed conflict. Historical experience suggests that treaties, bilateral and multilateral, are instruments of power politics to be tossed aside when convenience or necessity demand.

This historical experience is underlined by current world events. Six actual or potential war situations threaten mankind during the closing weeks of 1963.

The first is in Latin America, where the confrontation is acute between United States economic and political forces on one side and independence forces in Cuba and British Guiana on the other. There are other tension areas in Latin America involving shooting civil war, with Washington holding the gun on the Monroe-Doctrine-anti-Communist line and local groups opting for independence and self-determination.

Southeast Asia's conflict zone is a second situation, in which United States armed forces are engaged in a shooting war.

Third, is the confrontation over Berlin, where the armed forces of East and West face each other in battle dress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A fourth crisis situation, still unsolved, is the shooting frontier dispute between India and China.

Fifth, sharp border conflicts have reached the shooting stage between newly liberated peoples in North Africa.

Sixth is the French-German-Spanish axis, solidly Roman Catholic, organizing a continental bloc which excludes Great Britain, opposes United States policies for Europe, and is approaching a position of strength sufficient to repudiate the Potsdam Agreements and redraw Central and East European frontiers.

Any or all of these conflict situations may explode into a general hot war. In all six, armed forces are being built up or are being used to implement policy. In no one of these danger zones is the use or non-use of nuclear weapons a point at issue. In all of these there is a grave possibility that despite a test ban treaty or a treaty banning nuclear weapons, one or more of these local conflicts may lead into general wars as they did in 1914 and again in 1939.

Devastating wars were fought from 1914 to 1918 and from 1939 to 1945 without nuclear weapons. Even more destructive wars could be fought tomorrow if all testing was stopped and all nuclear weapons were scrapped. The real enemy of mankind is not a particular weapon, but the institutions of competitive national sovereignty, of imperialism, and of the warfare state; and the acceptance, in principle, of "just" causes that can and should be advanced by using armed struggle as a means of implementing policy.

Treaties Are Not Enough

TREATY: *a formal agreement between two or more nations, relating to peace, alliance, trade, etc.* (Webster.)

History and current experiences underline an obvious lesson: treaties are not effective deterrents to war. On the contrary, they have repeatedly served as agencies of war preparation, and as instruments in the preparation for armed struggle.

Recognition of this obvious fact does not make war inevitable, but it does compel mankind to search for means, beside and beyond treaty-making, that will end war and establish peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such means are at hand. A warless world, occupied by more than three thousand million human beings, is a present-day possibility. To be realized it must be organized on the federal principle and administered by a world government exercising sufficient delegated powers to establish order and maintain peace.

Peace treaties by the score have been made and broken. There is still time to make the institutional changes necessary to end war and establish peace.

For Shame!

Early in October, 1963, a hurricane, named Flora by the United States Weather Bureau, swept across the Caribbean. The storm passed over Haiti in 24 hours. In Cuba, however, it doubled back over the Sierra Maestra mountains. Trapped by the physical terrain, it swirled and raged for five days over an area about 250 miles in diameter. Winds blew up to 180 miles per hour. Eighty inches (more than six feet) of rain fell, flooding the lowlands, destroying towns, carrying ships and livestock out to sea. Highways, bridges, culverts, crops were washed away. Forty-five thousand families were left destitute. History does not record such utter destruction on a Caribbean island.

Ninety miles away, the United States, "richest nation on earth," sat smugly, even gleefully, on its bulging money bags and huge food surpluses, and officially did nothing for their stricken Cuban neighbors. Absolutely nothing!

A few hardy souls who had been smeared for organizing the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee bestirred themselves, as did the American Friends Service Committee, raised money and forwarded medicines and desperately needed relief as best they could through the Washington-maintained blockade. The International Red Cross offered help. But to its eternal shame be it said that Washington failed utterly to rise to the occasion with even a token of sympathy or material assistance for the hapless victims of an unparalleled natural disaster.

Honor and sentiment are poison in business.

—Paul Lafargue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

NOT FEUDALISM—CAPITALISM

BY ANDREW GUNDER FRANK

Carlos Fuentes' depiction of Latin America as a "decrepit feudal castle with a cardboard capitalist facade" is certainly poetic. But it is wrong. Latin America could better be called a decrepit capitalist castle with a feudal-seeming facade. Fuentes' error is symptomatic, if it does not go even straight to the heart, of MR Press's recent examination of *Whither Latin America?** For the attribution by most of the book's authors of many past and present Latin American ills to feudalism rather than to capitalism betrays their misunderstanding of the continent's past development—and therewith of capitalism itself—and renders dubious and misleading, at best, their discussion of Latin America's future.

A composite picture of the twelve essays—excepting principally the concluding "Notes" by Sweezy and Huberman—may, I hope without violence or injustice to any of the nine authors, be sketched in the following propositions: (1) Latin America is only just entering the stream of world history as an integral and determinant part (Fuentes, page 23, Johnson 25). (2) Its earlier (non) role is the result of European construction in Latin America of a feudal castle which, though it may have been glorious in its time, is now in a state of decay (Fuentes passim, Johnson 33, Frank 62, 72, O'Connor 91, Juliao 106, Agustin 106). (3) In the meantime, the regions of advanced capitalism, developing more or less independently of the rest of the world, left Latin America behind stewing in its feudal juice (Fuentes 10-11, Johnson 27, Huberman 50). (4) Because a similar process occurred not only between but also within countries, Latin America now has dual—really two—societies, one agrarian, feudal or semi-feudal, archaic, backward, etc.; the other urban, capitalist, commer-

* *Whither Latin America?* MR Press, 1963, cloth $3.00, paper $1.45.

Andrew Gunder Frank is a frequent contributor to MR. Two of his articles are included in *Whither Latin America?*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial, industrial, modern, etc.; each society being largely self-determining and independent of the other (Fuentes 11-12, Frank 62, 85). (5) Imperialism consists primarily of foreign exploitative economic activity; and it would help Latin America's economic development if this activity were stopped, curbed, or controlled (Fuentes 14-15, Johnson 33, Observer 43, Huberman 56, Frank 80-81, Agustin 120). (6) It is the foregoing features which, along with widespread and persistent poverty, characterize underdevelopment (Johnson 28, Huberman 48-49). (7) Economic development in Latin America—past, present, and future—is attributed largely to a sort of radiation from a domestic and/or foreign metropolitan center; and it is held that the periphery can, through cooperation, agreement, and alliance with the capitalist metropolis, benefit from such a flow relation (Fuentes 23, Johnson 28, Observer 43, 45, Sweezy 70). (8) This flow, and therefore economic development, has been too slow, thus resulting in two alternative or even simultaneous consequences: left-wing, bourgeois, parliamentary economic and political movements have sprung up such as APRA in Peru, Accion Democratica in Venezuela, Goulartism in Brazil, which show or showed promise of really changing all the foregoing and thus rendering socialism meaningless for the country in question (Johnson 28, 37); and/or (9) Latin America is now in such a revolutionary ferment that the people promise, by an act of will and decision, any day now to destroy this whole ramshackle structure and to substitute a liberating socialism in its place (Fuentes 9, Observer 46, Frank 63, 89).

I submit that these interpretative descriptions are, taken individually, mostly wrong, and, taken as a whole, very seriously misleading.

Some of the authors' related errors of fact or interpretation are worthy of mention. The base of political power, contrary to Fuentes (13-14) is not the feudal landlords, and Latin American armies are not caste armies (18). Brazil's agricultural surpluses are not, as Johnson (27, 35) maintains, due to efficiency in agricultural production. Peron neither had a program of rapid industrialization in Argentina, nor did he cause the country's troubles (Johnson 37). APRA and Accion Democratica are not left-wing parties (Johnson 37). Venezuela's land reform is, except in maintaining the status quo, far from ambitious (Observer 42). "Conservative Type I" land reform is not really just the last resort of the landowners (Frank 57). Peasants are not really unincorporated in national society (Frank 59). Mexico's failures are not due so exclusively to failure to solve the land problem (Frank 66, 77). And the systems of Guatemala, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, etc., still do lumber along and do not face imminent collapse (Frank 88).

A factually more accurate and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theoretically sounder picture might be sketched as follows: Latin American societies resulted from the worldwide expansion of "Western" mercantilism, capitalism, and imperialism. Characteristically, this expansion everywhere took the form of a simultaneous and interrelated dialectic development whose manifestations, each both the "result" and the "cause" of the other, are today known as economic development and economic underdevelopment. This capitalist development, with its associated exploitation of the "underdeveloped" sector by the "developed" counterpart through the latter's monopoly of force, capital, and commerce, manifests itself on many levels: internationally between the metropolitan and peripheral countries, and domestically between "advanced" and "backward" regions, between the city and the countryside, between commerce-industry and agriculture, between "modern" and "backward" agriculture. If this process is not viewed as a whole —as the dialectic development of a single capitalist system— the door is opened to misinterpreting the results as emanating from a dual system or from two systems—the world of the rich and the world of the poor— and to the associated misinterpretation of the former as "capitalist" and the latter as "feudal." Yet, as we shall see, this error runs with serious consequences through almost all of the essays under review.

As against the picture presented in *Whither Latin America?*, I offer the following: The continent has for nearly five centuries had an integral, contributory part in world development. Contrary to Carlos Fuentes and others, "backwardness," "underdevelopment," and feudal appearing relations, far from being the surviving remnants of some original feudal order in Latin America, are the result of economic "development" under capitalism itself. Indeed, it is hard to understand why or how, as is claimed, the expanding commercial and industrial capitalist system would have had either the interest or the possibility to establish a feudal, that is, closed system in Latin America. It did, of course, the opposite: it incorporated Latin America (and Asia and Africa as well) into its own structure. In this process, a sort of dual society did indeed emerge in Latin America, but not in the above cited sense of two separate parts, with a "feudal" peasant sector "isolated" from the capitalist national and international society. On the contrary, it is a dialectically dual society with different, but not separate, parts, one exploited by the other. If the Indians of the Andes and the Sierra Madre are "isolated," it is because retreat has been their only (and very partial) protection against capitalist exploitation of their land and labor. Power, like everything else in the "provincial" rural sectors, is intimately related to urban and international capitalist society through

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the economic (above all commercial), political (above all parliamentary backed by force), and social relations that link them to each other. Surpluses, agricultural or otherwise, are the result not of efficiency in production but on the contrary, along with the exploitation and profits associated with them, are the product of the monopolization of the foregoing relations. Least of all is it true—or even possible—that the base of national power in Latin America is the "feudal" landlords. On the contrary, power and the determination of the country's fate has rested with the domestic and foreign commercial and financial bourgeois oligarchy whose fortunes, in turn, are determined by their participation in the imperialist system.

Imperialism, thus, is not only this or that foreign company exploiting Latin American economies; it is the structure of the entire economic, political, social —yes, and cultural—system in which Latin America and all its parts, however "isolated," find themselves participating as exploited partners. The primacy of this imperialist structure in the determination of all else renders it quite impossible that the troubles of Argentina should be due to Perón or even Peronism, and quite unlikely that the primary reason for the failure of the Mexican Revolution is to be found in its failure to solve the land problem—or that land reform is necessarily more significant than the nationalization of petroleum. Poverty and wealth are the symptoms of underdevelopment and development, which in turn are themselves imbedded in the exploitative structure of the colonialist-imperialist-capitalist system and determine the aluminum skyscraper/tobacco road form it takes. Development cannot, therefore, radiate from the center out to the periphery. The periphery, instead, can develop only if it breaks out of the relation which has made and kept it underdeveloped, or if it can break up the system as a whole. Least of all is it true or even possible, therefore, that a relationship of cooperation or alliance between the two capitalist parts of the system can operate to the benefit of the underdeveloped one. On the contrary, this exploitative relationship is one of the primary contradictions of capitalism which, until resolved, will continue to produce even more underdevelopment.

If the foregoing picture of Latin America be accurate, even in its general outlines, then, as Sweezy and Huberman quite rightly observe in their "Notes," it cannot be that the bourgeois capitalist revolution (against feudalism) has still to be made in Latin America, or that bourgeois movements—through the electoral process, "land reform" such as Betancourt's, or any other process that remains within the present structure—can abolish underdevelopment and misery. The state in Latin America, even more so than the state discussed by Lenin in *The State*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Revolution, is an instrument of the bourgeoisie because it and its associated institutions are part not only of a national but of the international—that is imperialist — capitalist system. This exploitative entanglement must, accordingly, be broken; and this break, evidently, cannot be accomplished through exclusive reliance on the imperialist-capitalist institutions themselves. On the other hand, the foregoing picture gives us no reason to believe that the system can no longer lumber along —albeit at terrible costs—or that socialist revolution is imminent or will automatically occur if the Latin American masses decide that they have finally had enough and that the time has come to revolt. Instead, the revolution is the result of the deepening of these contradictions within capitalism and of the revolutionary organization which results from and must take advantage of these contradictions.

The second major weakness of the volume under review lies in the fact that the reporters almost unanimously fail to examine the relationship between the development of these contradictions and the organization of the revolutionary process and effort. Failing to link their discussion of the future to, or derive it from, their analysis of the past, they resort to *ad hoc* predictions, which therefore not surprisingly are also quite often wrong. The essays which least display this weakness—the concluding one of Sweezy and Huberman and that of Salazar Bondy—also turn out in their analysis of the past to be more consistent with the interpretation of capitalist development advanced in this review and less consistent with the composite picture painted in the remainder of the essays. As for the latter, their view of the future is subject to criticism (and rejection) on three principal grounds. First, their authors manage to derive quite inconsistent futures—imminent socialist revolution vs. bourgeois progress which renders socialism meaningless—from a common analysis of the past. Second, neither of these predictions gives any sign of being realized. And third, because there is no attempt made in these essays to indicate *how* these predictions and/or policies might be turned into reality.

It is naturally not possible within the space of a brief review to present anything like a rounded analysis of probable future developments in Latin America. Nevertheless, mere negative criticism is obviously not enough: an effort must be made at least to indicate some of the major factors that have to be taken into account.

The development of world capitalism since the Second World War has brought with it a deepening of the contradiction between development and underdevelopment in the non-socialist world. The gap has widened and the conflict deepened between the imperialist metropolis and its periphery;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and underdevelopment has increased (not decreased) absolutely in the latter (as a symptom, food production and consumption per capita in non-socialist Asia, Africa, and Latin America have generally fallen since before the War). Similarly, the contradiction between development and underdevelopment has deepened between regions and sectors within the periphery itself. In Latin America, the depression and the war created relative isolation (protection!) which in turn resulted, in some countries, in a spurt of autonomous industrialization. A postwar honeymoon of war-built foreign exchange reserves and a wave of "liberalizing" regimes followed. But the honeymoon was soon over. Contemporary with capitalism's return to "normalcy" and its renewed offensive highlighted by the Korean War, Latin America's terms of trade began again to decline—and balance of payments deficits to increase—accompanied by a wave of "dictatorial" governments. With their countries already in trouble, these governments proceeded to intensify the problem—with results in evidence today—by providing "liberal" concessions to imperialism, now not only in mining and utilities but also in consumer goods and service industries catering mainly to the higher income recipients. Already in debt to and under the control of the metropolis, Latin America fell ever more deeply into imperialist subjugation. Despite the area's poverty and against all the rules of orthodox economics, capital exports to the metropolis, principally to the U.S., rose, thus opening the door to still greater dependence and subjugation.

The deepening domestic structural underdevelopment in Latin America was perhaps initially hidden from local eyes by being confused, as it is by metropolitan opinion to this day, with some outward appearances of economic development, especially in consumer goods manufacture and the provision of services, in the growth of the "middle classes" which produce and consume this output. Four social groups, one might say, grew to or in importance. The monopolization of agricultural production *and distribution,* the decline in the growth rate of primary goods exports, often the decline in export earnings, and, indeed, the increase in food imports from the U.S., forced peasants off the land in a massive rural exodus. Many of these former peasants remained "unincorporated" into the urban economy and became the ever increasing floating urban sub- or maybe lumpenproletariat of the ubiquitous slums. This is the first group referred to. Others thrown off the land and some from the slums came to be incorporated into the second group, the working class more narrowly defined, by getting manufacturing and service-industry jobs. A third group consisted for the most part of white-collar workers—employed in burgeoning government bureau-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cracies, commercial offices, banks, etc. In some countries this group has grown to 40-45 percent of the labor force. Finally, the profits from all these developments and above all from the inflation which accompanied them served both to swell and to modify the fourth group, the bourgeoisie properly speaking.

Contrary to expectations derived from theory based on the experience of the metropolis and of the earlier progressive role of the independent middle classes in the latter, these developments have contributed in Latin America not to development but instead to increasing underdevelopment. Furthermore, these groups are for the most part a conservative, not a progressive, force.

In Latin America the economy consists increasingly of a one-product primary-export economy depending on an unstable and ever more slowly growing foreign market which serves as the only base of an overblown service sector. What is lacking is basic producer-goods industries which, if they exist at all, are increasingly controlled by foreign interests that are infiltrating this sector at an alarming rate. In consequence, the economy inevitably has no long- or even medium-term self-sustaining growth possibilities, is subject to heavy inflationary pressures, is highly unstable, and is an easy prey for further imperialist penetration. All of these elements and forces aggravate each other and interact with the underlying conditions in a vicious spiral, best illustrated perhaps by the case of Argentina.

The political consequences are not immediately encouraging. The members of the first three social groups and the new members of the fourth typically regard their recent entrance into their group as constituting their "personal revolution." Not unlike C. Wright Mills's white collar man, the members of the working and middle groups become dependent parts of a private or public bureacracy which has a marked client relationship to the bourgeoisie: they get social position, welfarism, and apparent income from the bourgeoisie, which mark them off from the peasants and the lower urban proletariat; in return, especially through organized-labor and middle-group political support of right-wing and centrist political measures and figures, they support the status quo. The income is only apparent because, of course, inflation systematically wipes out their monetary gains and transfers income from all three of these groups, plus the peasants, to the bourgeoisie and the imperialists who benefit from the inflation-producing measures.

Still, these new arrivals are relatively privileged groups, often a veritable aristocracy of the proletariat, who can be a progressive force in a limited way as long as they hope to achieve further gains but who, when their past gains are threatened, especially the mid-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dle groups among them, turn out to provide the main source of popular support for far-right politicians and "solutions" which promise to "re-establish stability," i.e., to protect and conserve their newly won gains. Thus, when the bottom drops out of the export market and the higher incomes are menaced, these groups are the first to turn from clamoring for a better future to looking into the past and trying to conserve what they already have by supporting the (fascist-type) Right. Paradoxically, they are joined in this political move by many who had a better past, often in the provinces, before the growing development-underdevelopment gap undermined their intermediary positions, and who now adopt a strictly ostrich-like attitude, burying their heads in the shifting sands of ultra-right-wing politics.

The bourgeoisie, both in Latin America and in the metropolis is, of course, the principal beneficiary of the system. Although there are conflicting interests and shifting alliances, the supposed fundamental contradictions between the "national bourgeoisie," the "feudal landlords," the "comprador bourgeoisie," and the "imperialists" are, as Sweezy and Huberman quite rightly point out and all talk to the contrary notwithstanding, very largely a myth. In the first place, as was pointed out above, the Latin American economies got to be what they are as part and parcel of the capitalist—first colonialist and now imperialist — system. Secondly, outside of Argentina, Mexico, and Brazil, there is no national bourgeoisie to speak of because the countries' role in the larger system left no room for national industry. Their bourgeoisies, far from being independent in the classical European sense, are the domestic groups which are the clients of foreign interests and the domestic beneficiaries of the whole capitalist system stretching from New York to the most "isolated" provincial farm or village. Far from being in fundamental conflict with any of these foreign imperialist or domestic "feudal" exploiters, the bourgeoisies intimately link them to each other, extracting their toll at the economic, political, and social crossroads of the system.

In the countries with some industry, the situation is not really fundamentally different. It is only more complicated in that the domestic industrial interests are also economically and politically intertwined with agrarian, mining, financial, domestic and international commercial, and speculative interests in general. Often several or all of these "sectors" are combined in a single financial group, company, or family. One group may be at odds with the others while they can afford it, but when the workings of the system and above all popular pressures threaten their common source of exploitative benefits, they quickly band together in a reactionary front, dragging

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with them as many of the other social groups as possible. The fundamental contradiction in the underdeveloped world being between all of them and those they exploit, how could it be otherwise?

Latin America—and indeed the world as a whole—is again in such a rightward wave. As the continent-wide stagnation in the growth rate and the mounting balance of payments crisis attest, the economy has again entered a phase of threatened disaster. At the same time, Cuba produced a certain panic among people with something to lose, and the United States launched an "anti-Communist" campaign in Latin America of unprecedented proportions. As a result of these factors, Latin America, far from "moving to the Left" as has been so widely proclaimed, is currently once again "moving to the Right," with the bourgeoisies engineering the move through "legal" parliamentary channels where it can and through the famous military coups where it must. How long this renewed, temporary rightward retrenchment will last is perhaps not yet to be foreseen.

The peasants and, in some cases some ex-peasant urban unemployed, are the ones who have nothing at all to lose from revolution and everything to gain. For many Latin American countries, such as Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina, and pre-revolutionary Cuba, it is in fact illegitimate and misleading to talk of "peasants" in the traditional sense of more or less independent and self-reliant cultivators. In fact, these "peasants" are the real proletariat—the dependent, insecure, often bureaucratized, residual-earning, exploited source of labor, whether they are still on the land or are now cast off into the city slums. It is on their shoulders that the entire "decrepit castle" rests. Paradoxically, however, most of the talk about revolution comes from the relatively more farsighted and more privileged labor, middle, intellectual, and even army groups. These people, when the chips are down and often even before, tend to back out of the revolution and to be content with reforms. That is, the talk about revolution is, so far, mostly just talk. The rural and slum proletarians, in contrast, tend to be quite nearsighted and to see only the land and the jobs which they want but don't have. The "revolutionary" leadership, including most especially that of the trade unions and the Communist parties, has so far come only from the ranks of the talkers and has been, and as the facts demonstrate, quite reformist-revisionist. Furthermore, in all cases until Cuba and in most cases to this day, the leaders have only led each other around, leaving the rural and urban slum proletariat and, if that is what it really is, lumpenproletariat entirely to its own quite feeble devices. Even now that some efforts are beginning to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be directed to the countryside, they are in effect mostly an extension to the land of the reformist revisionism of the city, long tried and found wanting.

Whence, then, the Revolution, and when? There can be no simple answer, and neither hope nor prophecy is enough. The development — underdevelopment contradiction will undoubtedly deepen internationally and domestically. The mechanism of dependent capitalism in the underdeveloped world has so far never permitted a way out of underdevelopment, and it shows no promise of doing so now. Underdevelopment will increase. The time-tested combination of successive (and sometimes simultaneous) "liberalizing" mystification with "dictatorial" retrenchment and intensified foreign infiltration, led by and for the bourgeoisie, will leave further marks on its victims. Right-wing "reforms" will, it seems probable, succeed less and less in their mystifying mission; and their most offensive (from their point of view defensive) actions will here and there call forth popular left-wing reactions. These will have to be used to help create revolutionary conditions. The repeated failures of bourgeois reformism must be translated into popular clarification about the roots of the difficulties. Some of the popular near-sightedness must be corrected. This is the work of revolutionaries, since reformists only seek to induce the people to substitute one reform for another. The popular reactions to bourgeois attacks must be channeled into meaningful and cumulative revolutionary forms lest they dissipate popular energy and contribute to a popular feeling of helplessness and failure. That also is the work of revolutionaries, not of reformists. Both revolutionary tasks must be directed to winning over to the people's revolutionary movement some of the popular groups, including part of the military, whom the bourgeoisie has so far bribed into mystifying and repressing popular sentiment. All of this is in greater or lesser degree going on in Latin America today.

But the people and their leaders will also have to go on the offensive; they cannot simply wait for conditions to ripen. An advance guard of the revolution, such as the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) in Venezuela, must take the offensive even while final victory is still out of sight, to hold out the goal domestically as the socialist world already does internationally; to force the hand of the bourgeoisie by, for instance, obliging it to take off its "democratic" mask, and to contribute to the accumulation of revolutionary experience. Most important, these steps must prepare the people and their leaders to act decisively when, generally with little or no forewarning, the opportunity is ripe. This is the work of revolutionaries. The revisionist reformists have, instead, in recent years

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

led their people in Latin America to be less, not more, ready to take advantage of the revolutionary opportunity. It will not do only to wait to strike the iron when it is hot. The iron must, at least in part, also be struck to heat it—and to provide the experience necessary for striking when the time, indeed, has come. The recent opening of the "Third Great Debate" between Revolution and Reform will, perhaps, contribute to the training of revolutionaries in Latin America as the second debate in its time did in the Soviet Union.

Give for Christmas . . .

MR PRESS PAPERBACKS

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
by James Boggs $1.00

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY
by Maurice Dobb (flexible cloth binding) 1.00

THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN
by Fritz Pappenheim 1.25

AMERICAN RADICALS: SOME PROBLEMS AND PERSONALITIES
Harvey Goldberg, editor 1.25

AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE
Bert Cochran, editor 1.25

WHITHER LATIN AMERICA?
by Carlos Fuentes and Others 1.45

MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS
by Leo Huberman 1.75

CUBA: ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy 1.75

THE PRESENT AS HISTORY
by Paul M. Sweezy (flexible cloth binding) 2.95

Total $13.65

PAPERBACK SPECIAL All the above books $11.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The perfect gift . . .
for a friend's

SOCIALIST LIBRARY

12 meaty pamphlets
by specialists in each field

MR PRESS **PAMPHLET PACKET $4**

Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	20¢
Principles of Communism by Engels (trans. by Paul M. Sweezy)	25¢
Socialism Is the Only Answer by Huberman and Sweezy	35¢
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite or Ruling Class? by Sweezy	35¢
The Theory of U. S. Foreign Policy by Sweezy and Huberman	35¢
Reflections on the Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	50¢
The ABC of Socialism by Huberman and May	50¢
Economic Development, Planning, and International Cooperation by Oskar Lange	50¢
British Guiana by Ved Prakash Vatuk	50¢
The War in Vietnam by Hugh Deane	50¢
The Split In The Capitalist World and In The Socialist World by Sweezy and Huberman	50¢
Latin America and the Alliance for Progress by Alonso Aguilar	50¢
Total	$5.00

PAMPHLET PACKET SPECIAL
All the above pamphlets $4

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to
Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside back cover*)

Our "letter of the month" is particularly gratifying because it shows that we are making a dent, albeit small, among ordinary workers:

> Thank you for the most interesting and enjoyable publication on my subscription list. As Shop Steward in my local I am particularly interested in the management-labor picture and the socialist viewpoint thereon. However, I find every article in MR to be of great interest, extremely well written and controversial. I use them frequently to stir up discussion in the shop.

Integrated Education, the "only magazine in the country devoted to explaining the need for racially-integrated schools" carries reports of integration experience and problems throughout the North and West. Subscription rate is $3 for six issues; address, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Season's greetings to all of you.

Have You Joined MR Associates Yet?
If Not, Are You Going To?
If You Are, Why Not NOW?

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV ON THE KEY ISSUES OF OUR TIME

a collection of selected speeches and reports which appeared in the Soviet press from 1956 to 1963 on the major problems of modern times: peace, foreign policy, imperialism, colonialism, national liberation movement, socialism and communism.

1. SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM, 192 pp.
2. THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT, 96 pp.
3. TO AVERT WAR—OUR PRIME TASK, 192 pp.
4. IMPERIALISM—ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE, ENEMY OF PEACE, 128 pp.
5. THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKING CLASS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, 128 pp.

Price for all 5 books—$1.00; single copies 25¢ each.

N. S. Khrushchev: COMMUNISM—PEACE AND HAPPINESS FOR THE PEOPLES, 2 vols., 870 pp.—$2.50. The Road to Communism, Documents of 22nd party congress, 660 pp., cloth cover ..... Price: $2.00

Order your 1964 subscriptions for Soviet periodicals in English and in the languages of the USSR.

Hundreds of books and pamphlets in Russian and English available.

UNIVERSAL DISTRIBUTORS COMPANY, Dept. F
52-54 West 13 St., New York 11, N. Y.

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

left wing of the British Labour Party, was first published in 1952. The new edition has a photographic supplement and a special introduction by the author's widow, Jennie Lee, herself a Labour M.P.

(2) *Marxism for Our Time,* by Gilles Martinet. In this book the author, who is the editor of *France Observateur* and one of Europe's most brilliant left-wing journalists, takes a critical look at the various tendencies in Marxian thought and attempts to assess their validity for the world today.

(3) *China Triumphs,* by Julio Alvarez Del Vayo. This is an eye-witness, up-to-the-minute account of developments in China. The author, formerly Foreign Minister in the Spanish Republican Government, and for many years Foreign Editor of *The Nation,* is now a special correspondent at the U.N.

(4) *Revolution in Seattle: A Memoir,* by Harvey O'Connor, with a Foreword by Leo Huberman. This is a stirring account, by a participant, of the epic labor and radical struggles which shook the Pacific Northwest during and immediately after the First World War.

(5) *Waste,* by Danilo Dolci. This will be the American edition of a recent book by the great champion of the impoverished masses of Sicily. The English edition has already had an enthusiastic press.

(6) *Capitalism as a System,* by Oliver C. Cox. This is a theoretical analysis of the evolution of capitalism as an international system from its earliest beginnings. Oliver Cox, Professor of Sociology at Lincoln University, Missouri, is the author of another MR Press book, *Caste, Class, and Race.*

We will be announcing publication dates and prepublication prices of these (and no doubt other) books in the months to come.

Scott Nearing's 80th birthday party, held in New York on November 7th, was a fitting tribute to MR's regular columnist and one of the world's best known socialist educators. Despite two days of steady rain, some 750 people turned out to pay homage to our esteemed collaborator. To judge by the way Scott looked and talked, he'll still be going strong on his 100th birthday twenty years from now.

Our mailer made a few errors in last month's list and, as a result, several subscribers did not get the November issue; one of them sent us the following:

> Where, oh where is my Monthly Review?
> It hasn't arrived in the mail.
> Has the FBI padlocked your offices yet?
> Are the editors locked up in jail?
>
> Hurry and send me my Monthly Review.
> It's very important, you see.
> Most people believe what the liberals say,
> But the liberals listen to me!

Except in the rare cases when our mailer makes an error, MR goes to all of you, automatically, as soon as it comes off the press. Generally speaking, then, if you do not get your copy, the reason is that you have not kept us posted on your latest address. If you have been having trouble getting your MR, please look carefully at the address on the envelope—if we have it wrong, let us know.

(*continued on page* 480)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If you agree that a sub to MR makes an

Ideal Christmas Gift

then consider these offers:

One gift sub for $5
you save $1

two gift subs for $9.50
you save $2.50

three gift subs for $14
you save $4

four gift subs for $17.50
you save $6.50

five gift subs for $20
you save $10

(For each sub outside the U.S. add $1)

We will enclose a gift card signed as you direct.

These offers end on December 31; after that date the rates go back to $6 for a one-year sub in the U.S.; $7 outside the U.S.

Remember: every gift sub you send to a friend is, at the same time, a gift to MR.

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED